

# Congressional Record

## PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-NINTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION

### SENATE

TUESDAY, January 19, 1926

(Legislative day of Saturday, January 16, 1926)

The Senate, as in open executive session, reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.  
As in legislative session,

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 90. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress trust-fund board, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925; and

S. 1267. An act to extend the time for the completion of the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between the States of Oregon and Washington, at or within 2 miles westerly from Cascade Locks, in the State of Oregon.

The message also announced that the House had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 172. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.;

H. R. 173. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rainy River between the village of Spooner, Minn., and Rainy River, Ontario;

H. R. 3755. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Elbert, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River;

H. R. 3852. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Columbia River at a point within 2 miles downstream from the town of Brewster, Okanogan County, State of Washington;

H. R. 4032. An act granting consent of Congress to the Brownsville & Matamoros Rapid Transit Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at Brownsville, Tex.;

H. R. 4033. An act granting consent of Congress to the Hidalgo & Reynosa Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4440. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Clarke County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Chunky River in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 4441. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Neshoba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5027. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Rochester and Monaca, Beaver County, Pa.;

H. R. 5379. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 5565. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Civic Club of Grafton, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North;

H. R. 6089. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Fox River in the county of McHenry, State of Illinois, in section 26, township 45 north, range 8 east of the third principal meridian;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the department of public works, division of highways, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to construct a bridge across the Palmer River;

H. R. 7484. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Red River near Fulton, Ark.;

H. J. Res. 64. A joint resolution to secure a replica of the Houdon bust of Washington for lodgment in the Pan American Building; and

H. J. Res. 107. A joint resolution to provide for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments.

#### CONSTITUTIONALITY OF ESTATE TAX

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD a letter to me from John S. Parker, a distinguished lawyer of New York and a well-considered memorandum by him as to the constitutionality of an estate tax.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

200 FIFTH AVENUE,  
New York, January 16, 1926.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I received a few days ago the copy of your speech on the subject of the proposed estate tax law and read it with great interest.

As requested by you when I saw you at your office last Monday, I am inclosing herewith a memorandum which I have prepared as to the constitutionality of the estate-tax provisions (Title III) of the pending revenue bill. It seems to me to be beyond question that Title III, if enacted in its present form, will be held by the Supreme Court unconstitutional and void, and that the same thing may be said of the estate-tax provisions of the revenue act of 1924.

Faithfully yours,

JNO. S. PARKER.

#### IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

An act (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxes, to provide revenue, and for other purposes

#### MEMORANDUM AS TO THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TITLE III, ESTATE TAX

I. The tax imposed by Title III (estate tax) of the revenue bill of 1926, upon the transfer of the net estate of every decedent dying after the enactment of the act, is a duty or excise within the meaning of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and as such is subject to the rule of uniformity as prescribed by the first clause of that section.

Estate, inheritance, legacy, and succession taxes are duties or excises within the meaning of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution and as such are subject to the rule of uniformity. (Knowlton v. Moore, 178 U. S. 41.)

II. By reason of the inclusion in Title III of the proposed act of the provision (sec. 301 (b)) allowing a credit for estate, inheritance, legacy, and succession taxes paid to any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, the whole title is rendered repugnant to the uniformity clause of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution and is void.

A tax is uniform, within the meaning of the constitutional provision on that subject, when it operates with the same effect in all places where the subject of it is found. (Edye v. Robertson, 112 U. S. 580.)

The uniformity thus required is the uniformity throughout the United States of the duty, impost, and excise levied; that is, the tax levied can not be one sum upon an article at one place and a different sum upon the same article at another place. The duty received must be the same at all places throughout the United States, proportioned to the quantity of the article disposed of or the extent of the business done. \* \* \* It is contended by the Government that the Constitution only requires a uniformity geographical in its character. That position would be satisfied if the same duty were laid in all the States, however variant it might be in different places of the same State. But it could not be sustained in the latter case

without defeating the equality, which is an essential element of the uniformity required, so far as the same is practicable. (Mr. Justice Field, in *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.*, 157 U. S. 429.)

It needs no argument to show that in its application under existing conditions in the several States of the Union there is no uniformity whatsoever in the amount of the tax, and it is no answer to the objection raised as to uniformity that the proposed law may be made to operate uniformly throughout the United States by action of the States.

In a recent case before the Supreme Court involving the constitutionality of the income tax law of the State of New York, which in its application discriminated against citizens of other States, the attorney general of New York argued that such discrimination could be removed in practice by appropriate action of the legislatures of the other States. The Supreme Court made short work of this argument, and the reasoning of the court applies with equal force to the proposed law now under consideration. The court said:

"In the brief submitted by the attorney general of New York in behalf of appellant, it is said that the framers of the act, in embodying in it the provision for unequal treatment of the residents of other States with respect to the exemptions, looked forward to the speedy adoption of an income tax by the adjoining States, in which event injustice to their citizens on the part of New York could be avoided by providing similar exemptions similarly conditioned. This, however, is wholly speculative; New York has no authority to legislate for the adjoining States; and we must pass upon its statute with respect to its effect and operation in the existing situation. But, besides, in view of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, a discrimination by the State of New York against the citizens of adjoining States would not be cured were those States to establish like discriminations against citizens of the State of New York. A State may not barter away the right conferred upon its citizens by the Constitution of the United States, to enjoy the privileges and immunities of citizens when they go into other States. Nor can discrimination be corrected by retaliation; to prevent this was one of the chief ends sought to be accomplished by the adoption of the Constitution." (Travis v. Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co., 252 U. S. 60, 81, 82.)

III. Said title III is an invasion of the rights reserved to the States by Article X of the amendments to the Constitution, and for that reason also is unconstitutional and void.

The tenth amendment reads as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

The avowed purpose of the proponents of the provision allowing a credit for State taxes paid is to force uniformity among the States in the imposition of inheritance taxes. The report of the Ways and Means Committee contains this significant paragraph:

"A very important change was also made in the application of the estate taxes. Under the present law a credit is allowed upon the taxes of the amount of any inheritance or estate tax paid to any State, up to 25 per cent of the Federal tax. In order to give the various States full freedom to make use of this tax, the committee decided to extend the credit which might be so allowed up to 80 per cent of the Federal tax. The several States, by the use of this provision, will be enabled to make use of the inheritance tax without additional cost to its citizens."

The power to enforce uniformity of the laws of the States in their domestic affairs is not among the powers committed to Congress by the Constitution.

"We must construe the law and interpret the intent and meaning of Congress from the language of the act. \* \* \* Does this law impose a tax with only that incidental restraint and regulation which a tax must inevitably involve? Or does it regulate by the use of the so-called tax as a penalty? \* \* \* In the light of these features of the act, a court must be blind not to see that the so-called tax is imposed to stop the employment of children within the age limits prescribed. Its prohibitory and regulatory effect and purpose are palpable. All others can see and understand this. How can we properly shut our minds to it? \* \* \* So here the so-called tax is a penalty to coerce people of a State to act as Congress wishes them to act in respect of a matter completely the business of the State government under the Federal Constitution." (Chief Justice Taft, in *Bailey v. Drexel Furniture Company*, 259 U. S. 20, 36, 37, 39.)

The only difference in principle between the above case and the proposed law now under consideration is that whereas in the child labor case Congress merely attempted, in the language of the Chief Justice, to coerce the people of a State, here we find an attempt to coerce the sovereign States themselves in the exercise of one of the very fundamental functions of sovereignty, that is to say, the imposition of taxes upon their citizens.

"Should Congress, in the execution of its powers, adopt measures which are prohibited by the Constitution, or should Congress, under the pretext of executing its powers, pass laws for the accomplishment of objects not intrusted to the Government, it would become the painful duty of this tribunal, should a case requiring such a decision come

before it, to say that such a law was not the law of the land." (Chief Justice Marshall, in *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 4 Wheaton.)

"It is the high duty and function of this court in cases regularly brought to its bar to decline to recognize or enforce seeming laws of Congress dealing with subjects not intrusted to Congress but left or committed by the supreme law of the land to the control of the States. We can not avoid the duty, even though it require us to refuse to give effect to legislation designed to promote the highest good. The good sought in unconstitutional legislation is an insidious feature, because it leads citizens and legislators of good purpose of promote it, without thought of the serious breach it will make in the ark of our covenant or the harm which will come from breaking down recognized standards. In the maintenance of local self-government, on the one hand, and the national power, on the other, our country has been able to endure and prosper for near a century and a half." (Chief Justice Taft, in *Bailey v. Drexel Furniture Company* (child labor tax case), 259 U. S. 20, 37.)

"Out of a proper respect for the acts of a coordinate branch of the Government this court has gone far to sustain taxing acts as such, even though there has been ground for suspecting, from the weight of the tax, it was intended to destroy its subject. But in the act before us the presumption of validity can not prevail, because the proof of the contrary is found on the very face of its provisions. Grant the validity of this law, and all that Congress would need to do hereafter, in seeking to take over to its control any one of the great number of subjects of public interest, jurisdiction of which the States have never parted with, and which are reserved to them by the tenth amendment, would be to enact a detailed measure of complete regulation of the subject and enforce it by a so-called tax upon the departures from it. To give such magic to the word 'tax' would be to break down all constitutional limitation of the powers of Congress and completely wipe out the sovereignty of the States." (Chief Justice Taft in *Bailey v. Drexel Furniture Co.* (child-labor tax case), 259 U. S. 20, 37.)

#### IV. Title III is void in its entirety

"It is elementary that the same statute may be in part constitutional and in part unconstitutional; and if the parts are wholly independent of each other, that which is constitutional may stand, while that which is unconstitutional will be rejected. And in the case before us there is no question as to the validity of this act, except sections 27 to 37, inclusive, which relate to the subject which has been under discussion; and as to them we think the rule laid down by Chief Justice Shaw in *Warren v. Charlestown* (2 Gray 84) is applicable—that if the different parts 'are so mutually connected with and dependent on each other, as conditions, considerations, or compensations for each other, as to warrant a belief that the legislature intended them as a whole, and that if all could not be carried into effect the legislature would not pass the residue independently, and some parts are unconstitutional, all the provisions which are thus dependent, conditional, or connected must fall with them.' Or, as the point is put by Mr. Justice Mathews in *Polindexter v. Greenhow* (114 U. S. 270, 304; 5 Sup. Ct. 903, 962): 'It is undoubtedly true that there may be cases where one part of a statute may be enforced as constitutional and another be declared inoperative and void because unconstitutional; but these are cases where the parts are so distinctly separable that each can stand alone and where the court is able to see and to declare that the intention of the legislature was that the part pronounced valid should be enforceable, even though the other should fail. To hold otherwise would be to substitute for the law intended by the legislature one they may never have been willing by itself to enact.' And again, as stated by the same eminent judge in *Sprague v. Thompson* (118 U. S. 90, 95; 6 Sup. Ct. 988), where it was urged that certain illegal exceptions in a section of a statute might be disregarded, but that the rest could stand: 'The insuperable difficulty with the application of that principle of construction to the present instance is that by rejecting the exceptions intended by the Legislature of Georgia the statute is made to enact what, confessedly, the legislature never meant. It confers upon the statute a positive operation beyond the legislative intent and beyond what anyone can say it would have enacted, in view of the illegality of the exceptions.'" (Chief Justice Fuller, in the prevailing opinion, in *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.*, 158 U. S. 601.)

Therefore if paragraph (b), allowing the credit, should be held to be unconstitutional, the whole title would fall, because it is obvious that Congress does not intend to impose the full tax without the credit.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN S. PARKER, Counsellor at Law.

NEW YORK, January 16, 1926.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of petitions, letters, and resolutions from citizens of Arizona urging adherence to the Permanent Court of International Justice. I ask that the letters and resolutions with the names signed to the petitions accompanying them be printed in the RECORD; and that these papers may lie on the table.



The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters, resolutions, and petitions are as follows:

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

Phoenix, Ariz., Dec. 17, 1925.

Senator HENRY F. ASHURST,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am transmitting to you the message of many prominent people in Phoenix and Arizona who are greatly interested in the World Court, which comes up to-day in the Senate.

For myself I was and am for the League of Nations, but we did not get it and it became a matter of politics and controversy.

I believe that the World Court is one step in the way of peace, and very sincerely hope that you can support it and vote for it in the United States Senate.

A merry Christmas and a happy New Year to you and yours.

Very sincerely,

Rev. J. C. TREAT.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,  
Phoenix, Ariz.

The following resolution was adopted at a mass meeting at Phoenix, Ariz., November 15, 1925, Chief Justice A. G. McAllister, of the supreme court, presiding. All the members of the Supreme Court of Arizona sat, with other leading citizens, on the platform. Judge Alfred C. Lockwood, of the supreme court, presented this resolution, which had been prepared by a committee and which was unanimously adopted by vote:

"Whereas we believe that the United States of America should participate in the World Court along with other nations of the world in an attempt to substitute peaceful settlements for war in case of disputes; and

"Whereas three successive Presidents—Wilson, Harding, and Coolidge—have urged upon the Senate of the United States a favorable vote upon the entry of our country into the World Court: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting of the citizens of Phoenix, Maricopa County, Ariz., that the United States of America should, through action of the Senate, vote to enter the World Court at the earliest possible moment; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators representing Arizona and also that a copy be given to the local press."

Rev. J. C. TREAT,

For the Ministerial Association of Phoenix, Ariz.

Rev. PHILIP Y. PENDLETON,

Central Christian Church,

Rev. RICHARD E. DAY,

First Baptist Church.

Rev. HARDY E. INGRAM,

First Methodist Episcopal Church.

Resolution prepared for submission that day at close of a noonday dinner given by Bishop Atwood, of Trinity Cathedral, at his home to this committee and others in honor of Dr. Loyal Lincoln Wirt, western secretary of the National Council for the Prevention of War, San Francisco, Calif., who was the speaker of the day upon this occasion.

PHOENIX MEMBERS OF ARIZONA NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE PREVENTION  
OF WAR

Chief Justice of the Supreme Court A. G. McAllister.

Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Alfred C. Lockwood.

Associate Justice of the Supreme Court H. D. Ross.

Judge Frank O. Smith, president Chamber of Commerce.

H. B. Watkins, secretary Chamber of Commerce.

C. O. Case, State superintendent of education.

John D. Loper, city superintendent of education.

E. W. Montgomery, principal Phoenix High School.

J. W. Laird, dean of Junior College, Phoenix.

Dr. A. W. Matthews, president State Teachers College, Tempe.

H. W. Benning, Young Men's Christian Association secretary.

Miss Grace Bennett, Young Woman's Christian Association secretary.

Mrs. H. B. Wilkinson, president Young Woman's Christian Association.

Mrs. C. F. Ainsworth.

Mrs. H. R. St. Claire, president Woman's Club, Phoenix.

Mrs. Samuel White, secretary Woman's Club, Phoenix.

Mrs. W. C. Foster, secretary department of international relations, Woman's Club, Phoenix.

Governor Hunt.

Mayor Whitney.

Postmaster Jones.

Mrs. Dwight B. Heard, Dr. Victor Rule, First Presbyterian Church.

Rev. H. L. Johnson, dean of Trinity Cathedral.

Dr. P. V. Pendleton, First Christian Church.

Dr. R. E. Day, First Baptist Church.

Dr. H. E. Ingham, First Methodist Episcopal Church.

Dr. C. Raymond Gray, Central Methodist Episcopal Church.

Rev. E. C. Roberts, Nazarene Church.

Rev. F. E. Maurer, Lutheran Church.

Rev. J. G. Treat, First Congregational Church.

Rev. T. O. Douglas, Tempe Congregational Church.

Rev. J. H. Smith, Garfield Methodist Episcopal Church.

Rev. R. H. Harbert, Methodist Episcopal Church.

THE MONDAY CLUB,  
PRESCOTT, ARIZ.

Resolution

The Monday Club, of Prescott, Ariz., representing a membership of 163 women, at a meeting held November 23, 1925, adopted, by unanimous vote, the following resolution:

"Whereas the Monday Club believes that the United States should take its place among the nations of the world in some concerted effort looking toward peace; and

"Whereas it believes that the Permanent Court of International Justice more fully realizes American ideals for the settlement of disputes by arbitration than is now afforded by any other peace movement; and

"Whereas a resolution embodying the Harding-Hughes-Coolidge reservations, that the United States become a member of this court will come before the Senate during the session of Congress beginning December 7, 1925: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Monday Club petition the Senators from Arizona, the Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST and the Hon. RALPH H. CAMERON, also the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH, chairman, to exert their best efforts to secure favorable action on the resolution that the United States join the International Court of Justice; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Senators from Arizona and to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; that a copy be spread upon the minutes of the Monday Club, and that copies be sent to the press for publication."

ETTA J. OLIVER,

111 North Marina Street, Prescott, Ariz.

BLANCHE L. WHETSTONE,

ESTELLE AUBREY BROWN,

Committee.

The Woman's Club of Flagstaff, Ariz., has expressed itself in favor of the United States taking its place among the other world powers in the effort to secure peace and heartily indorses Senate Resolution No. 5, known as the Swanson Resolution.

We hope you will give this your earnest attention when it comes before the Senate and work for its adoption.

Mrs. F. M. GOLD, President.

Mrs. R. E. TAYLOR, Vice President.

LAVEEN, ARIZ., November 28, 1925.

Mr. ASHURST.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed you will find a copy of the resolution as indorsed by the Laveen Women's Club of Arizona.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. WM. LOGSDON, Corresponding Secretary.

Resolution

Whereas the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs have always been staunch advocates of peace;

Whereas we have again and again affirmed our belief in the settlement of difficulties by the nations on the same peaceful basis that settlement is now effected between private individuals;

Whereas the one step that to-day is before our country looking towards everlasting peace is the proposition of our entrance into the International Court of Justice;

Whereas this is absolutely a nonpartisan matter: Therefore, be it Resolved, That the Laveen Women's Club go on record as heartily favoring the entrance of the United States into the World Court.

CENTRAL ARIZONA DISTRICT FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,

Peoria, Ariz., October 26, 1925.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution

Whereas the members of the Central Arizona District Federation of Women's Clubs have always been staunch advocates of peace;

Whereas we have again and again affirmed our belief in the settlement of difficulties by the nations on the same peaceful basis that settlement is now effected between private individuals;

Whereas the one step that to-day is before this country looking toward everlasting peace is the proposition of our entrance into the International Court of Justice;

Whereas this is absolutely a nonpartisan matter: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Central Arizona District Federation of Women's Clubs go on record as heartily favoring the entrance of the United States into the World Court.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. G. L. BISSINGER,  
President.

Mrs. R. D. LAKE,  
Corresponding Secretary.

GILBERT, ARIZ., November 21, 1925.

TO SENATOR ASHURST:

Whereas the members of the General Federation of Woman's Clubs have always been staunch advocates of peace;

Whereas we have again and again affirmed our belief in the settlement of difficulties by the nations on the same peaceful basis that settlement is now effected between private individuals;

Whereas the one step that to-day is before this country looking toward everlasting peace is the proposition of our entrance into the International Court of Justice;

Whereas this is absolutely a nonpartisan matter: Therefore be it  
*Resolved*, That the Woman's Improvement Club of Gilbert go on record as heartily favoring the entrance of the United States into the World Court.

Respectfully,

WOMAN'S IMPROVEMENT CLUB OF GILBERT.  
Mrs. PAUL L. CRANDALL, Secretary.

MORENCI, ARIZ., November 22, 1923.

Mr. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish you would permit me to say that I am most heartily in favor of the proposal that the United States enter the Permanent Court of International Justice now established at The Hague, and that it is my earnest hope that you are of kindred mind on the matter and will be ready to give all your influence as well as your vote to accomplish this end.

I have already conveyed to you the sentiment of the congregation of which I am pastor, a unanimous expression from the best part of our population, and I am now writing to give personal expression to my own position on the question. And further, I shall be very deeply disappointed should the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate hesitate or refuse to report out this proposition or should the measure be loaded down with reservations or other limitations calculated to defeat its purpose or to make it impossible for this country to play a positive and constructive part in the great movement to secure the adjustment of international disputes by law instead of by war. For once, may I not hope that mere partisan considerations will give way and that there may be heard only the crying need of mankind for peace?

Yours very truly,

ALLAN KRICHBAUM,  
Pastor, Presbyterian Church, Morenci, Ariz.

MORENCI, ARIZ., November 20, 1923.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the pastor and elders of the Presbyterian church of Morenci, Ariz., desire to state that we have been commissioned by the congregation of this church to make known to you its unanimous indorsement of the proposal that the United States enter the Permanent Court of International Justice already organized and established at The Hague as recommended by the late President Harding, and to express to you its earnest hope that you will use all your influence as well as your vote to accomplish this end.

To this we wish to add our own emphatic indorsement and to express to you our own personal feeling that our country should play a foremost part in the movement to secure lasting peace for mankind, the end of bloody war.

Yours very truly,

ALLAN KRICHBAUM,  
Pastor and Moderator of Session.  
L. J. OWEN,  
Clerk of Session.

BISHOP'S HOUSE,  
Phoenix, Ariz., December 1, 1923.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASHURST: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a recent meeting of the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Arizona. Will you not use your best efforts in this matter?

*Resolved*, That the conference of the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the district of Arizona, assembled in Phoenix, goes on

record as approving of and advocating the participation of the United States of America in the World Court, and that we urge upon the Senators from Arizona to support it with their votes and influence.

*Resolved*, That our secretary be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of our Senators in Congress."

Yours very sincerely,

BERTRAND R. COCKS, Secretary.

Signed:

J. W. Atwood, Bishop of Arizona; J. R. Jenkins, Archdeacon of Arizona; Bertrand R. Cocks, General Missionary of Arizona; Herbert L. Johnson, Dean of Trinity Cathedral, Phoenix; Edward H. Freeland, Trinity Cathedral, Phoenix; G. O. T. Bruce, St. Mark's Church, Mesa; Henry Clark Smith, St. Andrew's Church, Nogales; H. H. Gillies, Trinity Church, Kingman; A. W. Nicholls, St. Luke's Church, Prescott; George V. Harris, Epiphany Church, Flagstaff; Thos. R. Williams, Christ Church, Jerome; William J. Dixon, St. Paul's Church, Yuma; George A. Wieland, St. John's Church, Globe; E. C. Tuthill, Grace Church, Tucson.

MORENCI, ARIZ., November 22, 1923.

Senator ASHURST,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: I trust that I may be permitted to convey to you as our Senator the hope that you will use your great influence and power to cause the United States to enter the Permanent Court of International Justice.

I have always favored the League of Nations, but believing that a situation has been created in the United States making it almost impossible for our country to become a member, I therefore am forced to view with favor the Permanent Court of International Justice.

With many others in our community, I am convinced that the United States of America, backed by its preponderating influence and power, can and should aid in adjusting the great difficulties in which Europe is now struggling and which may even threaten our high civilization. It would seem that America can no longer hope to keep itself free from the influences resulting from conditions obtaining in Europe.

My dear Senator, I hope that you will not consider this letter presumptuous, but an expressed hope from one of your constituency that the United States will find a way to play a great and effective part in international adjustments.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

W. E. LUTZ.

MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION,  
Douglas, Ariz., November 30, 1923.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a recent meeting of the Ministerial Association of Douglas, Ariz., it was unanimously resolved that we urge upon our representatives in the United States Senate to support the "World Court" idea as suggested by our late President Harding in assisting foreign nations in getting back to normal conditions.

Sincerely yours,

S. F. FRASER, Clerk.

THE SATURDAY CLUB,  
Duncan, Ariz., January 26, 1925.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The majority of the Saturday Club members of Duncan at a recent meeting voted to ask our Senators and Representative to vote in favor of United States joining the World Court on the basis of the Harding-Hughes reservation.

Dr. Agnes McKee Wallace and myself send a minority report against joining World Court.

Believe me,

Most sincerely yours,

(Mrs. ROBT.) ALICE LEE MONTGOMERY,  
Corresponding Secretary of Saturday Club.

GLOBE WOMEN'S DEMOCRATIC CLUB,  
Globe, Ariz., May 27, 1924.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASHURST: At a special meeting of the Globe Women's Democratic Club, May 23-24, the World Court question was discussed, and it was moved, seconded, and carried that I convey to you the decision of the club in the matter.

The discussion of the "Bok peace plan" has brought a pretty general opinion, I think I may say, that for the United States to join the



World Court with the Harding-Hughes reservation is not only safe and practicable but advisable, and such is the expressed opinion of the club.

In the words of a representative of women's organizations, "The proposal of Senator Lodge (to form a new World Court) would delay our entrance into the World Court indefinitely. What the women want is constructive action now."

We are glad that the recommendation to join the World Court has been reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee at last, and now, of course, will come the contest to get rid of the hampering Pepper reservations and to get the Harding-Hughes reservations substituted. It was said a few months ago that a poll of the Senate at that time showed that there were enough favorable to do that, and we are sincerely hoping that that action will have your earnest support.

Very respectfully yours,

STELLA L. HECHTMAN,  
Recording Secretary,  
Globe (Ariz.) Women's Democratic Club.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,  
Tucson, Ariz., February 7, 1925.

Senator H. F. ASHURST,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: As a citizen of Arizona I desire to urge upon you the exertion of your interest to bring before the full Senate at the earliest possible date the question of the adherence of the United States to the World Court on the Harding-Hughes terms.

This great question is of outstanding importance as regards the future of civilization and the avoidance of war and its consideration should not be postponed. I feel that my self-respect as an American citizen demands every effort on my part to secure the participation of the United States in this court and I firmly believe that most of our citizens who have informed themselves as to the organization and purposes of the World Court are of the same mind.

Yours very truly,

F. L. RANSOME.

ALHAMBRA, ARIZ., December 5, 1925.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR:

#### Resolution

Whereas the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs have always been staunch advocates of peace.

Whereas we have again and again affirmed our belief in the settlement of difficulties by the nations on the same peaceful basis that settlement is now effected between private individuals.

Whereas the one step that to-day is before this country looking toward everlasting peace is the proposition of our entrance into the International Court of Justice.

Whereas this is a nonpartisan matter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Alhambra neighborhood go on record as heartily favoring the entrance of the United States into the World Court.

Sincerely yours,

ELDA HERSHEY,  
Chairman of International Relations.

Mrs. D. S. HERSHEY,  
Glendale, Ariz.

Mr. WILLIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Ashtabula, Ohio, remonstrating against the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oneida, N. Y., and vicinity, praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice under the terms of the so-called Harding-Hughes-Coolidge plan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BAYARD, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 117) for the relief of the owner of the Coast Transit Division barge No. 4 (Rept. No. 45);

A bill (S. 493) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *British Isles* (Rept. No. 46); and

A bill (S. 1519) for the relief of the P. Dougherty Co. (Rept. No. 47).

Mr. BAYARD also, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 494) for the relief of all owners of cargo aboard the American steamship *Almirante* at the time of her collision with the U. S. S. *Hisko* (Rept. No. 48);

A bill (S. 508) for the relief of the owners of cargo laden aboard the U. S. transport *Florence Luckenbach* on or about December 27, 1918 (Rept. No. 49); and

A bill (S. 530) for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Basce Indre* and all owners of cargo laden aboard said vessel at the time of her collision with the steamship *Housatonic* (Rept. No. 50).

Mr. KENDRICK, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to which was referred the bill (S. 1170) to provide for the appointment of a commissioner of reclamation, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 51) thereon.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GERRY:

A bill (S. 2604) to establish a board of public welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2606) to prohibit offering for sale as Federal farm-loan bonds any securities not issued under the terms of the farm loan act; to limit the use of the words "Federal," "United States," or "reserve," or a combination of such words; to prohibit false advertising; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 2607) for the purpose of more effectively meeting the obligations of the existing migratory-bird treaty with Great Britain by the establishment of migratory-bird refuges to furnish in perpetuity homes for migratory birds, the provision of funds for establishing such areas, and the furnishing of adequate protection of migratory birds, for the establishment of public shooting grounds to preserve the American system of free shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 2609) for the relief of James E. Van Horne; and

A bill (S. 2610) to authorize payment to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., a corporation, for damages to its rolling stock at Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N. J., on August 16, 1922; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2611) to improve the status of certain retired enlisted men who volunteered for duty and served as commissioned officers in the Army of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2612) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appraise tribal property of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 2613) granting a pension to Lottie M. Glazier (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 2614) to increase the efficiency of the Air Service of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2615) to authorize common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to transport any blind person, accompanied by a guide, for one fare; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 2616) for the relief of Herman Shulof;

A bill (S. 2617) for the relief of Charles D. Shay; and

A bill (S. 2618) for the relief of the National Surety Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2619) for the relief of Oliver J. Larkin and Lona Larkin, of Greencastle, Ind. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2620) for the relief of certain newspapers for advertising services rendered the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2621) to extend the benefits of section 4693 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to certain soldiers of the Civil War and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A bill (S. 2622) making an appropriation of \$100,000 for the improvement of the harbor and the levee on the Ohio River at Shawneetown, Ill.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas:

A bill (S. 2623) to find markets and to provide credits for financing the exportation of surplus agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND DOMAIN

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I desire to introduce a bill which I intended to present on yesterday, but overlooked. It is a bill providing for change of the name of the Department of the Interior to the "department of public works and domain" and to provide for the reorganization and more effective coordination of public works and the functions of the Federal Government in the aforesaid department.

I desire to make the statement that those who are behind the bill, the engineers of the country, are not opposed to the general reorganization bill. As a matter of fact, they are heartily in favor of it. They are not having this bill introduced now to interfere with the general reorganization bill. They do not propose to press this bill until it is demonstrated that there is no possibility for the passage of the general reorganization measure. I wanted to make this statement in justice to them. They desired to have the bill introduced so they could discuss its provisions.

I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The bill (S. 2605) to change the name of the Department of the Interior to the Department of Public Works and Domain and to provide for the reorganization and more effective coordination of the public-works functions of the Federal Government in the aforesaid department was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

#### IMMIGRATION OF CERTAIN WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. As in legislative session, I ask leave to introduce a bill regulating immigration and naturalization of certain veterans of the World War and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The bill (S. 2608) regulating immigration and naturalization of certain veterans of the World War was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COPELAND subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] introduced a very important bill relating to an amendment to the immigration law to permit the admission of certain Italian soldiers. I should like, as in legislative session, out of order, to present three short articles for printing in the RECORD in connection with that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York American of Monday, January 18, 1926]

#### FIVE THOUSAND WAR HEROES BEG REENTRY INTO UNITED STATES—FOUGHT FOR AMERICA—BARRED BY STATUTE FOR LIMITING ALIENS

The following letter, signed by some of the most prominent men in the industrial life of New York, who are of Italian extraction, has been received by the New York American:

EDITOR NEW YORK AMERICAN,

New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: May we call your attention to the astonishing fact that there are nearly 5,000 young Italians, formerly residents of this country, who after having enlisted as volunteers in the United States Army and serving this country in France now find themselves barred from coming back here by the United States immigration laws?

Having performed their full duty, they were mustered out at the end of the World War, and feeling certain that they would have no trouble getting back to the United States they went to Italy for a visit.

They merely took advantage of the fact that they were in Europe and near the land of their birth to go to see their relatives.

#### JUSTICE FOR THESE

We appeal to you to ask if the Hearst newspapers can not use their great influence to get justice for these young Italians, who had hoped and still hope to become good, useful American citizens.

Your newspapers have always stood for equal justice to all peoples. We are confident that after you have examined the facts you will feel, as we do, that these men should have been allowed to come back to us long ago. We ask you to work for their immediate admission to this country.

When our country needed these boys, they did not hesitate.

Many thousands of them threw everything aside and, without waiting to be drafted, enlisted voluntarily.

General Pershing was glad to have them.

They did everything that was asked of them.

They took every risk that any American citizen in the American Army took. They were among the boys who stood back of Pershing when he said, "Lafayette, we have come."

#### PROUD OF THEM THEN

These boys formerly trod the streets of American cities and were among the boys we sent foods and medicines to. We were glad in those days to do everything for them.

But a few short years ago some of these very boys marched down our avenues, and with our hearts full of gratitude we called them heroes. We didn't ask them where they were born.

They were American enough at heart to throw aside every consideration except the good of the American Republic. And we considered them American enough to be glad to accept the proffer of their lives.

All of the boys who are now in Italy hoping to get back here had come to the United States originally intending to become citizens. Had it not been that they saw fit to perform the greatest possible service for this country they would now probably all be American citizens.

When these boys originally came to the United States they did not expect an easy time. They knew they had to give as well as receive, and that in return for the great opportunities they would find in our land they would have to give all of their energy and ability, and that they could not help themselves without helping the United States.

#### WILLING TO TOIL

They knew from the history of the past that it was an uphill fight to come here as an Italian immigrant and progress to the upper rungs of the ladder of success. But they were willing to go through everything that faced them, because they knew that Uncle Sam has had occasion proudly to observe his Italian stepchildren go into high places in American art, literature, finance, and industrial development.

They showed their willingness to meet their obligation by going right into the Army when the call for men came, and before they were fairly started in the industrial army of America.

We feel that it is un-American to keep these men out. We talk as Americans, purely and simply. We think we understand the minds and hearts of all true Americans who may have been here for generations before us when we say that the founders of the American Republic would let these Italians come here and take their proper place in the life of the country they adopted.

#### WANT PUBLIC TO KNOW

May we urge that this matter be taken up at once by your newspapers, that you investigate the facts, and that you begin letting the entire American public know of this situation? May we ask that you work toward the introduction and passage of any necessary laws to remedy this wrong?

Your newspapers have done many glorious things in the past, and we hope you will add new glory to your name by making a great fight for these men who want to come back to us and again be a part of our national life.

Very sincerely,

RALPH CILUZZI.  
ANTHONY PATERNO.  
JOSEPH PIROZZI.  
HARRY CHAMPOLL.  
VICTOR CERANONE.  
PASQUALE SIMONELLI.  
ANTONIO STELLA.

N. B.—In your investigation you may find that this same situation may exist as to young men of foreign extraction other than Italian; and if you do, we pray that you will fight for their admission just as strongly as you do for the admission of the Italians.

[From the New York American of Tuesday, January 19, 1926]

#### BOTH HOUSES AIM TO BRING HEROES HOME—IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS DRAW BILL TO ALLOW UNITED STATES VETERANS REENTRY TO ADOPTED LAND—REPRESENTATIVE ROYAL JOHNSON OF SOUTH DAKOTA AND SENATOR REED OF PENNSYLVANIA READY TO FIGHT FOR THE MEASURE

(By John A. Kennedy, Universal Service Staff Correspondent)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—The first step in a movement by the Government to take down the barriers which now prevent the return to the United States of thousands of foreign-born American war veterans, barred by quota provisions of the immigration law, will be taken in both the House and Senate to-morrow.

At that time a concurrent bill drafted to-day by immigration officials will be introduced by Senator DAVID A. REED, Republican, of Pennsylvania, member of the Immigration Committee, and by Representative ROYAL C. JOHNSON, Republican, of South Dakota, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

#### LIFT BARS 12 MONTHS

The bill proposes to lift quota bars for a period of 12 months for all persons holding discharges from the armed forces of the United States.



It also will eliminate another injustice to aliens who served under the American flag by validating the naturalization papers of hundreds of American veterans whose citizenship papers were recently declared invalid by the Supreme Court.

Care is being taken in preparing the measure to see that it meets every requirement of the courts.

#### SPEEDY RESPONSE

This was the speedy and patriotic response to an appeal made to the Hearst newspapers by Italian-American war veterans that an almost incomprehensible injustice unwittingly done thousands of their fellow soldiers in the American Army, as well as American war veterans now in other countries, be remedied.

Already Senator REED has had informal conferences with his colleagues on the Immigration Committee with regard to the situation. Every Senator thus far interviewed is said to favor the bill.

Both Senator REED and Representative JOHNSON will press for early action by the committees to which the bill is referred, so that passage can be expedited.

More than 5,000 former American soldiers, in foreign lands, residents but not citizens of this country, who offered their lives in defense of the flag, are stranded in Italy alone, careful survey discloses.

One thousand bear scars of battle, with records of valiant heroism written both on their bodies and in their discharge papers presented by the Government when they were mustered out of service.

Thousands of American war veterans are in the same situation in other European countries. All are eager to return to the land for which they fought, but are prevented by the quota restrictions of the present immigration act.

#### VISITED NATIVE LANDS

The majority of their number are men who marched to the recruiting stations and volunteered in the stirring days of 1917.

When the armistice brought their period of service under the Stars and Stripes to an end, these men elected to visit their native lands to see the loved ones from whom they had been separated for years.

While the visits were in progress Uncle Sam passed a new immigration exclusion law. The quota allowed Italy was very small. Only the families of Italians then in this country could be allowed to enter.

The loyal Italians who fought and bled in France must wait. These men are still waiting.

"Ours is not an ungrateful Government," said Representative JOHNSON, himself a wounded veteran of the A. E. F., when told of the circumstances in which Italian-American veterans now find themselves.

"Every Member of Congress should and, I am sure, will be in favor of speedy enactment of this bill.

"When Congress passed the last immigration act it did not intend to bar men who have served the Stars and Stripes in times of war.

#### VALIANT SERVICE CITED

"The men who fought for America in time of war are certainly acceptable to her in times of peace.

"The supreme test of allegiance to a country is the test of service in war.

"I don't care how large their number, nor how far the Government will have to go to provide passage facilities for their return to the United States, these loyal Americans should be given leave to return at once."

[From the New York American of Tuesday, January 19, 1926]

#### UNITED STATES VETERANS' RELIEF CALLED URGENT STEP

(By Senator DAVID A. REED, United States Senator from Pennsylvania. Written for Universal Service)

WASHINGTON, January 18.

Although I am emphatically opposed to tinkering with the present immigration laws, especially as regards letting down the bars set up by the quota restrictions of the present act, I feel sure the situation in which American war veterans in Europe now find themselves should be given speedy remedy.

The men who have fought for this Government certainly have a right to live here.

Soldiers, sailors, or marines who took part in the World War, either in France or at home, received such a baptism in Americanism as should entitle them to entrance into this country without respect to quota laws.

The situation revealed by Universal Service as existing in Europe, where valiant soldiers, many of them with remarkable records on the battle fields of France, are barred from this country, should be given speedy remedy by this Government.

I earnestly hope that the bill granting them entrance, which I plan to introduce to-morrow, will be quickly adopted by both Houses of Congress.

By so doing the National Legislature will right a real wrong.

#### THE WORLD COURT

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I offer a resolution and ask that it be read and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 119) was read, as follows:

Whereas the people of the United States have not had the opportunity to fully inform themselves as to the true meaning of the so-called World Court; and

Whereas there is no immediate necessity for the United States to pass any resolution in reference thereto; and

Whereas it is but fair and just to give the people the right to express themselves fully and thoroughly upon this subject: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the date to vote upon the pending resolution and protocol of the World Court is hereby fixed for the 8th day of December, 1926.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE THE PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE

Mr. STANFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 120), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-ninth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. MCKINLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 121), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-ninth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 172. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.;

H. R. 173. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rainy River between the village of Spooner, Minn., and Rainy River, Ontario;

H. R. 3755. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Elbert, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River;

H. R. 3852. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Columbia River at a point within 2 miles downstream from the town of Brewster, Okanogan County, State of Washington;

H. R. 4032. An act granting consent of Congress to the Brownsville & Matamoros Rapid Transit Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at Brownsville, Tex.;

H. R. 4033. An act granting consent of Congress to the Hidalgo & Reynosa Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4440. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Clarke County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Chunky River, in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 4441. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Neshoba County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5027. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Rochester and Monaca, Beaver County, Pa.;

H. R. 5379. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 5565. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Civic Club, of Grafton, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North;

H. R. 6089. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Fox River in the county of McHenry, State of Illinois, in section 26, township 45 north, range 8 east of the third principal meridian;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the department of public works, division of highways, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to construct a bridge across Palmer River; and

H. R. 7484. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Red River near Fulton, Ark.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. J. Res. 64. A joint resolution to secure a replica of the Houdon bust of Washington for lodgment in the Pan American Building; to the Committee on the Library.

H. J. Res. 107. A joint resolution to provide for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### POLICE RAID ON CAFÉ

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a newspaper clipping which I ask to have read, after which I desire to make a personal remark with reference to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will read as requested. The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the Washington Times, January 18, 1926]

#### DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY IN LIQUOR AND TRAFFIC CASES

(By Bill Price)

When the impetuous Senator BLEASE, of South Carolina, attacks the Police Department for arresting women and releasing diplomats participating in a "likker" party at a cabaret a few nights ago he doesn't know that this diplomatic "immunity" stuff is abhorred by all Washington policemen.

The District Commissioners have reported to the State Department numerous instances of flagrant violations of traffic laws of the District by diplomatic attachés and members of their families, accompanied by the grossest insults to traffic officers who sought to make arrests, but were confronted with the "immunity" claim. Nothing has ever been done about it.

The Carolina Senator, though, is merely following his usual trail of decrying the strict application of law to the unimportant personages of life while the ones of consequence and importance get off easily; maybe never arrested at all. The "cotton-mill boys" of South Carolina and folks who have to "work for a living" have always been ardent supporters of the Senator. You can't blame them either, because he is always fighting for the "under dog" in life.

According to him, bootleggers swarm the Senate and House Office Buildings, "even come under the very dome of the Capitol," and go unmolested. "Prohibition is only for the poor devils who haven't got the money to buy liquor," or who, when they buy in pint quantities, are held to the law by enforcement officers.

Diplomatic "immunity" in whisky should extend only to foreign representatives in their own embassies or legations. When they go outside of these embassies, which are regarded as emblematic of their respective nations, they should become amenable to the laws of this country or of the District.

When diplomatic attachés openly, deliberately violate traffic laws of the District, speeding when they get ready, and endangering lives, they should be amenable to our laws, just as they would if guilty of graver crimes.

There was the case of a few days ago of the attaché of the Egyptian legation speeding at 40 miles an hour. The attaché's only excuse to the policeman who followed him and called him to account was that he was "in a hurry."

Some time ago a Washington policeman who hopped on the running board of a speeding machine had his cap grabbed off his head and contemptuously thrown to the ground. This was by "the wife of the secretary of such and such an embassy." When the officer insisted on credentials he was called a "dirty American pig."

Washington policemen simply can't help themselves. If they arrest American women who make themselves pals of foreign attachés in drinking bouts in public places they merely do their duty. American women can't mix in where tar is without getting smeared. Policemen do not make unpopular laws. They merely enforce them. If they didn't do this they would be dismissed.

The immunity of Members of Congress from arrest is antiquated and should no longer apply. This congressional immunity had its foundation in the practices of the early English parliaments. When royalty gave way to democracy in England, and parliament was established, political conditions were so bitter that it was possible for royalists to arrest on trumped-up charges a majority of the members of Parliament on their way to meetings of that body, thereby thwarting the will of the people. Members of Parliament who lived many

miles away, and were days in getting to London, were made immune to arrest, because it was felt that the people of a parliamentary district should not be deprived of representation, especially through unfair political tactics.

No such conditions prevail in this country to-day.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I wish to state, taking what Mr. Price said to be true in reference to the police department, that I do not think they should receive orders from any superior officer which would prohibit them from performing their well-defined duties. I think when such is the case it is their duty to report to some superior authority that they are being hindered in the performance of their duty by some inferior who is willing to show partiality.

The bill that I introduced yesterday does not exempt Senators or Representatives in Congress, or anyone else, but provides that all the Federal officers of the country shall be instructed to enforce all laws equally and impartially against any men or women anywhere within the limits of the United States.

#### AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article from the Arizona Gazette which gives an account of the session of the American National Livestock Association in convention assembled at Phoenix, Ariz., on January 12, 13, and 14, 1926.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? If not, leave is granted.

The article is as follows:

NATIONAL MEET OPENED—PRESIDENT BIXBY IN ADDRESS TO COWMEN—VIGOROUS DENUNCIATION OF FREIGHT RATES BY SPEAKER—800 IN ATTENDANCE

Vigorous denunciation of existing livestock freight rates and of grazing fees on the national forests and a plea for better tariff protection for the industry was contained in the annual address delivered this morning at the opening session of the American National Livestock Association by President Fred H. Bixby, of Long Beach, Calif.

Following in the wake of the four all-State conventions which occupied the first two days of the week, the American National Livestock Association, with representatives from 14 Western and Middle Western States, all prominent in the cattle-growing and beef-packing interests of the country, opened its twenty-ninth annual convention at the Masonic temple this morning. More than 800 cattlemen and packers attended the initial opening.

President Bixby devoted a part of his address toward the administration of the packers and stockyards act and said that "perhaps a congressional investigation might develop something of interest."

"We believe the present freight-rate schedules on livestock are excessive, unsound, and unfair, and should be reduced," Mr. Bixby told the assembled delegates.

#### SAYS FEES EXCESSIVE

"We believe the present charges for grazing on the United States forest reserves are in some instances too high—in most cases more than the cost of administration of the grazing—and in many cases the mechanical administration of grazing in the forests most unsatisfactory."

"We are against commercialization of the forests," Mr. Bixby asserted, "and want tenure of our rights to be stabilized and standardized by law rather than to remain subject to the jurisdiction of some department head in Washington. We have always stood for some control of the unappropriated public domain. The 186,000,000 acres now known as public or Government land must be regulated in some equitable way so that the users of the grass on these ranges can expect protection, proper administration, and permanency of rights at the smallest cost possible. Special preference for the present users and for those whose adjacent privately owned lands are dependent upon the grazing of these Government areas must be taken into consideration."

#### TARIFF DEMANDED

"We must have a tariff of 6 cents a pound on green or fresh salted hides and 15 cents a pound on dry hides," Mr. Bixby declared. "This duty would increase the value of our cattle from \$2 to \$3 per head, and would work a hardship on no one. In addition to this, dressed meats, canned meats, and all other meat products should be adequately protected. There is a certain amount of protection now, but not enough."

"At present the United States is the dumping ground for all the surplus hides of the world," he continued, "and prices of our domestic production are on the world level. A fair duty on hides would put some 'pep' back into the cattle business."

Mr. Bixby also expressed dissatisfaction with the commissions now being assessed stock growers at the central markets, and the demand was made by him that these charges be reduced to a level commensurate with the price received for cattle by the stock growers.



## YEAR'S WORK REVIEWED

"Among other things that we stand for," Mr. Bixby asserted, "are the eradication of predatory animals, truth in fabric, truth in meats, against unfair restrictions on oleo products, uniform sanitary and quarantine regulations, and uniform chattel mortgage laws."

In reviewing the work of the past year Mr. Bixby asserted that the association had accomplished a great deal, but that "we have not secured all that we went out for, nor all that we were justly entitled to."

"The greatest asset of a militant organization such as ours," he declared, "is that we are ready and equipped at all times to defend our rights."

## FIGHTING BUREAUCRATS

Marked enthusiasm followed the reading of a letter by George K. Bowden, extending warm personal greetings and cordial good wishes of United States Senator RALPH H. CAMERON to the assembled delegates.

Advice to "get closer together, cooperate fully, and demand your just rights in the great questions of grazing fees and utilization of public lands" was the main subject in the missive wherein the Senator urged a continuance of the substantial backing of the legislative problems shown in the past year by the members of the organization.

"It is true," Senator CAMERON wrote, "that we have picked a fight with the bureaucrats in Washington, but at least we are making an honorable fight and I believe a successful one to restore to people of the West a reasonable and sane administration of these great natural resources."

Mr. CAMERON praised the members of the livestock association for their alertness in rallying to his support, and for their enthusiasm manifested when the waiver for grazing fees was first placed by him in Congress.

## RULE INVOKES GUIDANCE

The first session of the convention, conducted by President Bixby, opened at 10.15 a. m. with an invocation by Rev. Victor A. Rule. Henry G. Bolce, president of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, gave the first address of welcome, after which Judge Frank O. Smith, president of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, extended hearty welcome to the visiting delegates to the gold spot, and assuring them of the hearty cooperation of the local civic organizations in any problems that might come up during their stay in the city.

The response was given by George A. Clough, delegate from San Francisco, filling the place of former President Ike T. Pryor, who was unable to be present. Mr. Clough was raised in Arizona, his grandfather having been a pioneer in this State. Organization in the agricultural projects throughout the country, he asserted, was the cause of their success and prosperity, and maintained that it was the hope of the cattlemen to so organize themselves, thus placing the cattle industry on the same basis.

## AFTERNOON SESSION

He also touched lightly on the problem of labor which was facing the Southwestern States, inasmuch as the American cowboys were rapidly fading from view, giving way to Mexicans.

The problem of proposed legislation as to the national forests and public domain, which was discussed by George K. Bowden, attorney for the Senate Committee on Public Lands, was under consideration this afternoon.

Other speakers of the afternoon were: J. M. McFarlane, president of the Utah Cattle and Horse Growers' Association; Sam H. Cowen, attorney for the association at Fort Worth, Tex.; and T. H. Ramsey, president of the Pacific National Agricultural Credit Corporation, San Francisco.

## THE WORLD COURT

The Senate, in open executive session, resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 5, providing for adhesion on the part of the United States to the protocol of December 16, 1920, and the adjoined statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice, with reservations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BLEASE. I had two articles that I expected to read this morning with reference to the World Court, but I shall postpone reading them until a later day. I therefore yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cameron	Dill	Gerry
Bayard	Capper	Edge	Gillett
Bingham	Caraway	Ernst	Glass
Blease	Copeland	Fernald	Goff
Borah	Covzens	Ferris	Gooding
Bratton	Cummins	Fess	Greene
Brookhart	Curtis	Fletcher	Hale
Bruce	Dale	Frazier	Harrell
Butler	Deneen	George	Harris

Harrison	McMaster	Pittman	Stanfield
Hedlin	McNary	Ransdell	Stephens
Howell	Mayfield	Reed, Mo.	Swanson
Johnson	Means	Reed, Pa.	Trammell
Jones, N. Mex.	Metcalf	Robinson, Ark.	Wadsworth
Jones, Wash.	Moses	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh
Kendrick	Norbeck	Sackett	Warren
Keyes	Norris	Schall	Watson
King	Nye	Sheppard	Weller
La Follette	Oddie	Shipstead	Wheeler
Lenroot	Overman	Shortridge	Williams
McKellar	Pepper	Simmons	Willis
McKinley	Phipps	Smith	
McLean	Pine	Smoot	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The Senator from California will proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, the multifarious duties of a Senator of the United States sometimes preclude us from the preparation which ought to be made in a matter of the consequence of that which is pending before this body and sometimes make it impossible for us to engage in those matters in which we may be very much interested. I find myself somewhat in that situation to-day. Since I returned for the session I have been entirely engrossed with what I deem to be the most constructive piece of legislation of this decade—the development of the lower Colorado River—and I have had little opportunity to prepare, as the subject demands, an address upon the matter of the entrance of the United States into the World Court.

I realize, of course, sir, that the titanic figures upon this floor have presented this question in its every aspect. I realize, too, that there is nothing that I could add to what already has been said, nothing that I could add to that which I have said from the inception of this controversy; for, Mr. President, since February, 1923, when the late President Harding first suggested that we enter the World Court, in season and out, wherever the opportunity presented itself, I have voiced, feebly, of course, my remonstrance, and have endeavored to present the reasons which actuated me in opposing what he proposed and what is now before the Senate of the United States.

I have listened with interest whenever the opportunity was accorded me to what has been said upon this floor. I have listened to the eloquent Senators who have presented the case of the court with reservations and to the eloquent Senator, who is the leader of the opposition, who has presented the case with other reservations. Mr. President, I am opposed to the entry of the United States into this court with or without reservations. I am opposed to the entry into this court—

1. Because if the court is what its proponents insist, our entry would be an idle and futile act;

2. Because we have ready means at hand, with the right of selection, in The Hague court for the peaceful determination of every controversy;

3. Because joining the court inevitably will take us into the League of Nations;

4. Because if this court has any efficacy I decline to submit American questions to foreign judges, a majority of whom may decide our fate;

5. Because it violently wrenches this country from its American policy of 140 years and takes us finally into Europe's political life;

6. Because if behind the decisions of the court are the sanctions of the league, joining the court does not mean peace, but may involve us in Europe's strife; and

7. Because, sir, to join this court in the manner suggested, avoiding every question of consequence and asserting our aloofness whenever peace might be threatened by other countries would make us the poltroon among the nations of the earth. For this and other reasons, too, which it may be unnecessary to elaborate, I oppose the pending resolution.

Tepidly I am interested in reservations, but only tepidly. I believe, as the eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] said in his original address, that reservations, after all, will be of little consequence. I recall, sir—oh, how soon we forget—I recall the struggle that we had to keep out of the League of Nations. I recall how reservations were presented of one sort or another during that momentous struggle. I also recall, as the Senator from Idaho recalled only a few days ago, the words of Lord Grey when he said, "Let them come in with the reservations; after they are in they amount to nothing." So, sir, if I believed in those words of Grey—and I do—if I believed that, after all, we are merely in some degree modifying the wrong that we insist exists in the court, I could not give my acquiescence to reservations except, in frankness, for the purpose ultimately by indirection of defeating that which I believe should be directly defeated.

Mr. President, I recognize the foreordained situation that is before this body. I recognize, sir, that no words of mine; I



recognize, sir, that no words of any man in this Chamber; I recognize, sir, there is no power within these doors that will enable us perhaps to escape from that foreordained situation. It is solely for the purpose that on the record there may be embalmed some of those things which I have said all over this country and that in the proper forum considering the question may be presented what has at other times and in other places been expressed.

This court, sir, has its votaries outside of this Chamber; this court, sir, is to be put over upon the American people not because Senators here believe wholly in it, although, of course, I question neither any man's belief nor any man's good faith; this court, sir, is to be put over on the American people because of a poisonous propaganda that has been in vogue since 1920; that failed then when we had the opportunity to go to all the American people; that succeeds only now, sir, because we have the opportunity to go to only 96 representatives of the American people. This propaganda that has been abroad in the land is like all propaganda of interested parties, where others are merely disinterested. Those with selfish interests are always alert and active; the disinterested, alas, act but sporadically and spasmodically. I smile a bit cynically when I listen to Senators on this floor speak of propaganda against the court. Propaganda against the court!

The pitiable little circulations that have been sent forth against it are of no consequence when an avalanche, a maelstrom of propaganda from New York City and from those who expect to make profit out of taking us into Europe has been, since 1920, poured forth in a constant and continuous flood. Consequently, sir, perhaps it succeeds; but finally there will come a day in this Republic, a day again like the day in 1920, when the people of the United States shall have the opportunity to express themselves upon this matter; and then, sir, with that expression, and that alone, shall we who take the position that I take to-day be satisfied and accept the result. I am not satisfied to accept a result of false, poisonous, and misleading propaganda.

Into every church, into every woman's organization, into every quasi-public association, into little children's schools the propaganda has been sent all in the sacred name of peace, all asserting, all insisting, that the only way that world peace can be brought about, the only method in which we can perform our moral duty to the world is for us to join this court.

I recall, sir, instances of propaganda in the past, instances that have succeeded, none of which, however, have been more deceptive nor of worse duplicity than this in respect to the World Court. I read, sir, only a few weeks ago of a distinguished English general who boastfully asserted in the city of New York that during the World War he had manufactured photographs of dead Germans and had put the story all over the world that the Germans were boiling their dead for fertilizer. He boastfully asserted it and he was oblivious to the enormity of what he had done until an outraged public opinion in the next few days denounced him in unmeasured terms.

I recall the propaganda during the war of children in Belgium whose arms were mutilated, and who were shockingly treated by the invaders. I remember talking to some gentlemen who had come from Brussels just after the war, who had at first commiserated people there over the atrocities that had been committed, and who were laughed at and told that no such atrocities had existed at all. I can recall propaganda of a different sort, too. I remember this beneficent arms conference that was held here in the city of Washington, that all of our pacific friends throughout the land tell us was a marvelous agency for peace, and tell us, too, how in that arms conference we contributed so much to the peace of the world. Do you know, sir, what information we had, during the period of that conference, of what was happening?

I hold in my hand a little brochure by Capt. Dudley W. Knox, of the United States Navy, a little brochure that every man who believes in his country ought to read. It is entitled "The Eclipse of American Sea Power," and it deals with the disarmament conference. It demonstrates what a fraud, a delusion, and a snare the 5-5-3 ratio is. In the very beginning of it Captain Knox quotes the remarks of Mr. Wickham Steed, the editor of the London Times, in a speech made by him a brief time after that arms conference.

Mr. Steed said:

The American delegates refused to give out any news during the conference. They left this whole matter with the British publicity agent, Lord Riddell, and I am not giving away any state secrets when I say that when Lord Riddell left Washington there was general lamentation among the American and other correspondents, who wondered where they would proceed to get the real news. That may have been

quixotic on the part of Americans, but rather than be under any suspicion of using their press to turn public opinion against nations with whom they may have had differences, they did this, and the American delegates were absolutely and honorably silent.

Read that brochure, you who say you are interested in our Navy, and I undertake to say that there is not an expert in the Navy Department to-day who is not tainted with politics but will agree with it and will tell you that the 5-5-3 ratio is a fraud, that it does not exist, and that while America scrapped warships Britain scrapped blue prints. Propaganda, though, has made our people have a different idea, and propaganda has led them to an utterly false conclusion. It is the propaganda, sir, upon this World Court, the propaganda that has invaded every avenue in this country, the propaganda that starts with the statement that the only means of obtaining peace, the only way of preventing war, the only mechanism that exists for the prevention of strife among nations, is this League of Nations court; and therefore that it is the duty of the United States of America forthwith to enter into that court.

If I undertook to tell you of the resolutions couched in just that language that have come to me I would be busy for the next 14 days, and I would be violating the ideas of debate that have been expressed by the distinguished Vice President and lay myself subject, doubtless, to a cloture thereafter—if I undertook, sir, even to pile upon this floor the resolutions and the letters from good men and women, from societies and organizations, from little children who have been lied to about this matter and who pathetically write "in the name of sacred peace, to prevent all wars in the future, for the sole purpose that there never again shall be strife between nations or men, take the United States into the league court"—if I undertook this, I would erect a wall as high as the ceiling and as broad as this Chamber.

It is a wicked thing, sir. That war is a wicked thing every man, of course, concedes. There is no normal man but that hates war. Every normal human being, to the limit of his ability, will endeavor to prevent war; but there are some things, sir, that are almost as wicked as war. A nation may fight a war, may even lose, and yet wax strong again. A nation may undergo all the agonies of war, and yet, with character untainted, again rise to great heights. But a nation, sir, whose character is corroded by hypocrisy and falsehood; a nation, sir, whose very essence and moral fiber are destroyed by insidious and false propaganda—that nation, sir, has no future at all; and what I cry out against is this propaganda, false in fact, that has been put over on the American people, and that has no justification in the facts.

Mr. President, I preach abhorrence of war; but, sir, I preach with equal emphasis abhorrence of pretense, cowardice, hypocrisy and duplicity in our national life. Personally, sir, I prefer a truculent d'Artagnan to a sniffling Pecksniff. I prefer, sir, that our people should understand; and in passing let me remark that those who are the proponents upon this floor of this measure have not indulged at all in the statements that have been made abroad in this land, and upon which the so-called public opinion of our Nation has been founded. No man here insists that this is a measure which will prevent war. No individual cognizant of the facts will insist publicly, upon his own individual responsibility, that peace will result or that war will be prevented by this impotent court—none, sir, as I propose to demonstrate before I conclude; and if it were possible I would blazon upon the sky for all these churches, for all these women's organizations, for all these good people to see throughout this land, that that which has been told them and upon which they have passed their resolutions is false in fact and has been calculated to deceive them for a base and an ignoble motive.

I recognize, sir, how many good people are interested in this question. I am not doubting them nor questioning them here. I recognize, sir, that the holiest emotions of mankind have been played upon by certain people in charge of this propaganda in behalf of the World Court. I recognize that the aspirations that distinguish man from the brute and raise him sometimes to the level of a god are the aspirations that this propaganda has utilized for the purpose of having him deal with his representatives in the Congress of the United States. Nevertheless, sir, I recognize, too, that behind this propaganda there is another force. There is another force, sir, that expects, out of this action of the United States Senate, to gain profit, to make money; and it is that sinister force behind this propaganda against which I cry out, and against which the American people ought to be warned.

Propaganda everywhere; and because so aptly the use of this propaganda recently was expressed I want to read to you a



very brief article recently appearing editorially in the American Mercury.

In six months—

Says this article—

It will be a century and a half since the Yankee brat performed the heroic feat of cutting its own umbilical cord; nevertheless, it remains at nurse, and under constant tutelage and admonition. The fount of honor is still at St. James's; the writ of that court runs both in the country clubs of Pittsburgh and Minneapolis and in the cloisters of Harvard and Yale. One recalls the solemn referendum of November 2, 1920, and one observes the persistent and even lusty prosperity of the League of Nations propaganda to-day. There are plenty of Walter Hines Pages left; the pilgrimage of the bar association last summer made a whole herd of them. And if all of them perished overnight there would still be the weekly swarms of visiting English novelists, shipping magnates, vaudeville hoofers, princes of the blood, itinerant ecclesiastics, exchange professors, note shavers, lecturers, spiritualists, horse-trainers, bootleggers. These men are illuminated by diverse and sometimes antagonistic visions. They bring various messages. But upon one subject they all agree, in public and in private, on the Long Island links and in the Broadway supper clubs, in Wall Street, and along the remotest back stretches of Chautauqua. They agree upon the moral duty of the United States. It is the moral duty of the United States, it appears, to join the League of Nations, and if not the League of Nations, then the World Court.

Then, following, another brief paragraph:

Such is the substance of the current demand that the United States repudiate the solemn referendum of 1920 and enter the league—or some antechamber of it. It is no more spontaneous than the Anglomania of 1915. There are actually not 100,000 people in the United States who show any sign of an honest yearning to put the country into the league, and of these not a thousand have ever offered a rational reason for it—that is, a reason based upon national self-interest. The rest is mere wind—music—a preposterous gabble about moral duty, issuing from England and here echoed mainly by palpable Anglomaniacs. The old propaganda machine is at work again, with its bearings red hot. It failed in 1920, but it did the trick in 1917, and now there are obvious hopes that it will do the trick again. So every incoming ship brings recruits for its crew, and Lady Diana Maudlin works the resorts of fashion as the dean of Mayfair works the resorts of piety, and judges are hauled off the bench and college presidents from the feasts of Rotary to keep it going.

Propaganda, sir! There is propaganda all over this land. But how at variance are the views that are expressed by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], those of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LEXROTH], and those of the proponents of the league, who are men of responsible position, when they express themselves as to what this court is. Neither here upon this floor, nor in the addresses of those who are the heads of the agitation outside, in one or more of the colleges of this land, is the attempt ever made to say that this particular court will bring peace, or prevent war.

I realize, sir, that various reasons are suggested to us here for joining the court. I have listened with deep attention to the remarks of the Senator from Montana, and those of the Senator from Wisconsin, both of whom minimized what the court was, and undertook to demonstrate that it was nothing; and in that they admirably succeeded. Other Senators on this floor have presented other reasons for joining the World Court. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY], in his very brief but pithy address, said that we should join the World Court in order that we might sell our wheat, our corn, and our hogs; and as I listened to him when he delivered that speech, and thought of the plight of the farmers of our country, I began to doubt the wisdom of the position I have maintained, and I began to see, in vision, the transportation of our wheat, our corn, and our hogs, across the ocean to Geneva, to be disposed of to the International World Court of the League of Nations. Perhaps, sir, the distinguished Senator from Illinois has thus solved the entire farming problem of his territory and the territory contiguous to it.

I listened to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], express himself in that delightful and epigrammatic way that is his, in an address that was indeed charming in character. I heard in that address none of the talk that is indulged by these organizations outside about the peace of the world, none of the stuff about the prevention of wars in the future as a result of our joining this court; not at all. I saw that for very material reasons, entirely appropriate, sir, in this material era, he would have us join the World Court. Then, in the conclusion of his address, when he spoke of Citizen Genet, and Washington's admonition, he

said, in substance, that if anything arises we do not like here—after in the court we will take the precept of Washington, that was written in words of fire during that memorable period in our history, when Genet came here from France to have us indulge in France's war, and we will say, "We stand aloof, because it is to our interest to do so."

So it will be seen that upon this floor we have a variety of reasons for joining the court. The Senator from Montana says it is a feeble and a halting step. The Senator from Wisconsin says substantially the same thing. Neither of them—and I compliment each upon the fact—seeks in any degree to substantiate the propaganda that has been put over upon the people of this land concerning this court or concerning its ultimate efficacy.

The position I maintain, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, is no new thing with me. It is the position I maintained from 1918 on; that, please God, while I am in public life and when I am retired to private life I shall yet maintain, with all the vigor that God has given me, because I believe that the step we are taking to-day, that which will soon be put over on this body, is the first false step in America's career; that its possibilities can not at the instant be foretold, and no man can say what peril the future may hold for us with that first false step taken.

There is no illusion upon the part of the league men in this country at all. There is no error in their position upon this matter. There is, in the minds of the men who fought the fight since 1918, no mistake as to what we are doing in the matter of this world court.

Oh, ye gentlemen upon this side, who pride yourselves upon your regularity, just let me make you a prophecy. After you have done the job, listen to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and other Democratic brethren on the other side of this Chamber congratulate you upon having finally approved the great Democratic doctrine and the policy of Woodrow Wilson. You will hear this with variations, and you will have it in more speeches than one in the days to come.

I congratulate my Democratic brethren upon their restraint in this debate. Clever are they in the presentation of this matter. Restrained have been their utterances, but restraint will be gone when the deed shall have been done by regulars upon this side of the Chamber, and when the deed shall have been done by the regulars on this side of the Chamber I want to be present for a couple of days, if my duties will permit, and listen to my Democratic brethren congratulate the regulars of the Republican Party upon this side.

What will happen, sir, if we enter this court? You realize, and I realize. When this matter first was bruited by the President of the United States in 1923, I indulged immediately in some facetious remarks. They are of no consequence, but because of the rejoinder they brought forth, and brought forth from the chief exponent of the League of Nations in all the West, the man in all the West who has made the fight for the League of Nations and is now making the fight for the World Court, I want to read just those few facetious sentences I uttered, and that rejoinder which came to me immediately thereafter.

When it was proposed in February, 1923, that we enter the World Court with certain reservations—"reservations!" Oh, when did we hear that word before? Reservations! Reservations! Ah, you, sir, from Montana, are consistent; you, sir, from Wisconsin, are consistent, for, if I recall aright, there was a time in the struggle concerning the League of Nations when these gentlemen sat upon an ex-parte committee for the purpose of preparing a reservation to Article X which should be put over, and under which we should enter the League of Nations. I recall how the task was almost perfected, when 16 men—call them what you please—"irreconcilables"—or call them by any epithet that may be known to the house of Morgan or to international bankers, call them anything you wish, sir, I care not, but the job was perfected and we were right at the entrance of the League of Nations when those 16 men called the thing off through the then leader of the Republican Party in this Chamber.

So it is a natural thing and a consistent thing for the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Wisconsin to be asking us to enter the World Court, with reservations, two of which, if I did not misunderstand the distinguished Senator from Montana the other day, are practically shams and the others of which are of mighty little consequence in any regard at all.

I repeat, sir, I am not interested in whether we enter the World Court with five little reservations or seven big reservations. The point is, I do not want to enter at all, for if we enter, either with three reservations or five or seven, the result will absolutely be the same; we will be tied in exactly the same fashion.



I was recurring, sir, to the remarks I made when first President Harding asked us to enter the court, and when he presented to us his reservations. I said then:

If we now do what is asked, the situation is this: We are wholly out of the league. We are in part of the league. By reservations we are out of the part of the league we are in. The part of the league we are in, and from which by reservations we get out, functions as a part of the league with our assistance.

In the language of a great editor of the West, "All of which is partly true."

Thereafter I received this letter. I here read this letter, and I read it, with permission of its author, because it is an example of intellectual honesty that shows conclusively just exactly what this world court is, just exactly what those who are the League of Nations leaders expect to do with us after we enter the World Court. The letter was dated Omaha, February 27, 1923:

MY DEAR JOHNSON: How small the world is now that electricity has put us all into one room!

Anyhow, I read in the paper this morning your sarcastic quotation from an alleged "great writer," who could perhaps be identified—"all of which is partly true."

You are quite right.

These are his words, not mine:

Your strictures on the Hughes-Root-Taft plan to sneak in the back door of the League of Nations are "partly true." Hughes's arguments for it are at most "partly true." The whole scheme is illogical, impractical, insincere, and cowardly. *And I am for it.* But not for these reasons. You, from your standpoint, will be quite right in being against it. There is no present practical situation calling for action. It is a purely academic, theoretical proposal. There are theoretical arguments for it which are "partly true." You can make others as good against it. I am for it, because, as an opportunist, if the Government has not the courage to walk into the league by the front door, I am willing, not to approve, but to submit to the alternative policy of sneaking in the back door. It will ultimately get us in. That is the final reason why you should be against it and I for it. But in your immediate strictures on the manner of it, I agree with you and am glad if you found my phrase one which you could use, even derisively, as a weapon in the criticism. In Lord Chesterfield's trite language: "Thus you see, my son, with how little wisdom the world is governed."

There is the story. That is the story of the court. We are going into the court not for the settlement of those controversies that we have with other nations at all. We are going into the court because we are going to be taken finally into the League of Nations. It follows just as absolutely as night follows day. There can be no escape from it and, logically from the standpoint of the leaguers, there should be no escape from it. Sir, if we are to go into European broils; sir, if we are finally to destroy the policy that has been ours for 140 years; sir, if this country now in 1926 is to alter the course that has made our country what it is and go into European politics, I prefer as an American with flag flying and head high to go in the front door, as America ought to go, and not to sneak to the side door or side entrance or to be shoved through a trap door into the League of Nations. So far as I am concerned I prefer that you shall take us in as we ought to go in if we are to go in. Why should you do otherwise? What are you doing to us? You gentlemen who want to take us into the league, what do you say we are going to do hereafter?

But before coming to that particular part of the subject let me read another prophetic utterance. This prophetic utterance is of a gentleman from beyond the sea who saw and understood just exactly what would happen to us finally in the matter of the league. One of the officials of the league, Mr. Hagerup, of Norway, reporting the court's constitution to the assembly of the league away back in 1920, used this language:

You know that a representative of the United States of America, a man of the highest authority, Mr. Elihu Root, took part in the preparation of this constitution. The political party to which he belongs in the United States will soon come into power and though this party has not yet decided to go into the League of Nations it has proclaimed in a resolution that it is quite prepared to accept the court. I think I shall be voicing the general sentiments of the assembly—

That is the Assembly of the League of Nations—

when I say that this resolution has within it important results. It is a first step leading to the entrance of the United States into the league.

Does anybody doubt it? Tell me that this court is an independent body and we may join it if we see fit and then act as we desire thereafter and never be involved with the league

at all? The very logic of events, the irrefragable proof of what may transpire, makes it not only unlikely but utterly impossible that we should be in this part of the league and we shall not ultimately be a part of the league itself.

What are we to do if we join the court? The gentlemen who are proponents of the court say, "Nothing." They say to us, "You are not bound when you enter the court. You are bound to nothing at all. You get into the court," say they, "and then you stand aloof from it. You are not going in," say the proponents of the court, "to settle American questions, for already we have the mode of settling them." They deny that we are going into the court for the purpose of settling European questions. For what purpose are they going into the court? Somebody errs, Mr. President; somebody is being fooled, Mr. President. Are we fooling the American people or are we fooling the people across the sea?

It is a futile and an idle thing to say to us, "Go into this court, stand aloof from every controversy, have nothing to do with that which may mean the peace of the world if it occurs across the sea." That is exactly what the proponents say to us: "Do nothing as a member of the court and nothing can be done to you." What kind of a position is this for the United States of America? We boast that we are the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. We prate of our obligation to civilization and mankind. We tell of the things that we have done in the past and those things that we may do in the future in behalf of all humanity. Then we join the World Court, deny its jurisdiction in anything pertaining to us, and hold ourselves aloof from any question that involves Europe, the one place on the face of the earth that is likely to engender war.

Not so, Mr. President; not so at all. I would not have my country in any such position as that. If we go into the World Court, I would have my country perform its function and do its duty. Talk to me of moral obligations on the part of America to enter the court, and when we get in there deny that there is any moral obligation that rests on us in relation to any question under the sun! It can not be, sir, that that sort of a position will be maintained by us; and if it were maintained by us we would be not only the laughing stock of the world, but we would be worse—we would be the poltroon of all the nations of the earth. We will go in, if we go in, and we will do our duty; we will do it fully, we will do it accurately, and we will do it no matter what the consequences may be. But to assert what these gentlemen assert in reference to our attitude after we once go in is a position that no American should ever suggest for an instant that his country should take.

Our people generally do not understand what the court is. I found that out when wandering around the country, and you, sir, doubtless have found it out, too. What this court is is little understood, not at all understood by those who pass their resolutions and who demand that forthwith we enter it for the sake of the peace of the world.

Just visualize this court with me, sir, for a moment. Just visualize it! We understand what a court is in the ordinary acceptance of the term. We believe that our courts are maintained to remedy wrongs and to redress injuries and ultimately to administer justice. We understand courts of that sort. Assume that we reside upon a certain part of a certain street. Upon that street and next to us resides our neighbor. He is brutal. He is ruthless. He is cruel. He is grasping and he is avaricious. He is stronger than we are. He comes to us on some day when his passions are aroused and he appropriates a part of our property. He appropriates a part of our property and, not content with that, he assaults us. We rush to the near-by court and we say to the judge who is there, "This neighbor of ours, brutal, ruthless, cruel, has assaulted us. This neighbor has appropriated a part of our property. We want from your honor some measure of justice. We want our property returned and our injuries redressed." The court says, "Will your neighbor come into court?" We answer, "Of course he will not come into court. He is the wrongdoer." The court thereupon says, "I have no jurisdiction. Case dismissed."

That is exactly the thing that they are asking us to join, Mr. President. That is exactly what the World Court is, expressed in homely language. No compulsory jurisdiction has the court. No process has it by which it may compel a wrongdoer to come before it and submit itself to its arbitrations. If a nation of Europe, drunk with its power, mad with its militarism, shall encroach upon the property of another nation of Europe, then it may be called into the great World Court of International Justice? Not a bit of it. All the wrongdoing nation has to do is to say, "I will not have anything to do with your court," and the case is dismissed. No longer is there anything that may determine the righteousness of the cause or redress the wrong that may have been done.



Why, Mr. President, how many criminal nations do you think will come into the World Court after committing a criminal act? The great nations of the earth have denied it compulsory jurisdiction. We are going in under exactly the same idea, denying compulsory jurisdiction. What criminal nation encroaching upon the property of a weaker nation, doing it harm by war or otherwise, will voluntarily submit its criminality to this so-called court? Ah, sir, it is not a world court; it is not a court at all. It will not make for peace in the world.

It can not make for peace in the world. One of the chief proponents of the court, in speaking concerning it or writing in the *Christian Century*, December 24, 1925, Mr. Manley O. Hudson, admitted frankly this fact. He said:

I can not say that it has prevented any wars, nor that it will ever prevent any. I do not regard it as probable that nations would fight about the kind of legal questions which they are now willing to submit to the World Court.

What becomes of all the balderdash and the nonsense that has been spread broadcast over this land about the prevention of war by this court? It does not prevent war and it can not prevent war. But the wickedness of the proposal that is before us, the vice of it, in my opinion, is that we go into this court—go into it to do something that we know not what, and refuse to engage in anything that it may do that we do not like.

The naïve words of the President of the United States, when he first suggested it, accurately stated the facts. He said then:

It is a convenient instrumentality to which we may go but to which we can not be brought.

A convenient instrumentality to which we may go but to which we can not be brought. Accurately that describes the court. If we can not be brought to it, other nations can not be brought to it. The virtue we commend of its inability to deal with us can scarcely become a vice when applied to other nations.

It is a singular situation that presents itself here. Our Presidents—both President Harding and President Coolidge—said we are not going into the league. They asseverated that, and unquestionably in the utmost of good faith they made that asseveration. But the singular thing presented in the discussion is that the proleaguers want us to go into the court because they think the President mistaken, and the antileaguers want to keep us out of the court for precisely the same reason. It is a paradoxical situation that is thus presented, and it illustrates the danger of going into the thing.

Mr. President, something has been said during the course of the argument about party responsibility and party pledge. The platform has been read indicating that the Republican Party has pledged itself to entry into the court, and while it is quite true that the particular provision does so state, it contains in its very next line a denial of the statement itself.

But that is neither here nor there. If the Republican Party and the Democratic Party and every other party had decreed entrance into this court, I still would stand here voicing the views that are mine, without regard to the pronouncements of any party platform.

I have observed, sir, that party platforms are often for me and those of like opinions to mine to be obeyed, but are to be disregarded whenever others of different opinions may desire. I recall the debate upon this floor upon the child-labor amendment. If there were any question upon which the Republican Party had taken its stand, and taken its stand absolutely, it was the question of child labor, and yet I heard the Senator from Wisconsin taunt the Senator from New York because of the latter's stand upon the amendment. The Senator from New York, with a right that was his—because every man must determine his position according to his conscience or his judgment—the Senator from New York, the leader of his party in the great Empire State of the Union, stood here in violation of the pledge of the Republican Party in the United States. That was his right, just as it is my right to-day to stand here against the paradoxical pledge of the Republican Party concerning the World Court.

Sir, history affords example after example of just exactly that kind of independence which has been lauded and remembered, when the men who were mere rubber stamps and who merely responded to a party lash or to a partisan demand have been forgotten. I can recall historically during the Jackson period when Andrew Jackson felt himself almost at war with France. Singularly enough, the acute situation was brought about by a debt settlement. France owed us \$5,000,000; France had defaulted in the payment and had broken faith. Jackson, with that singular force of his, demanded again and again and in no uncertain terms the payment of the amount. Finally he

asked the Congress of the United States to give him an appropriation of \$500,000 to put this Nation in a state of defense. The party which was opposed to Jackson opposed his request. In the House of Representatives that party took its stand against Jackson's position; but up rose that grand old man of Massachusetts, John Quincy Adams, so hostile to Jackson that carefully he treasured everything that Jackson daily did that he did not like that he might inscribe it in his diary at night—old John Quincy Adams stood upon the floor of that House and said that when the country was at stake he knew no party, and he made the fight for the Jackson appropriation for the United States of America. I remember the words of Rutherford B. Hayes, "He serves his party best who serves his country best." I recall another instance when a Senator from the great State of Massachusetts, George F. Hoar, broke for the time being with his friend William McKinley and stood upon the floor of this body fighting the subjugation of the Philippines against the dictum of the Republican Party of the United States. I can recall how in that time the Legislature of Massachusetts reported a resolution that did it infinite credit, a resolution that I would commend to the distinguished gentlemen who now represent that State in this body.

I recall other instances as well. I can recall that in every case where the fight has been made by some individual in behalf of his Nation his name has been remembered in the annals of his country, while the individuals who responded to the party lash and to party regularity have never even had a jot or a tittle in the lines that have been written of the story of their times.

Whether the Republican Party has in one instance or another said that we should enter the league or enter the court, I care not. In 1920 the Republican Party said, if I could understand the language that was employed, we would not enter the league. I remember 31 gentlemen straining their consciences at that time and saying in substance to the people of the United States, "Elect Warren G. Harding President as the means by which we shall enter the league." I recall, I think, that among those 31 was a distinguished gentleman who has been quoted so copiously upon both sides of this Chamber—Mr. Elihu Root. I can remember how night after night in that Presidential campaign I took a delight in answering those 31 gentlemen and denying what they said to the people of the United States of America in defiance of the Republican platform. Oh, if those great men could do that, then smaller men who sit here may as well do likewise. Those 31 great men of the Republican Party, in defiance of the platform of the Republican Party, said to the Republicans and to the people of the United States the way by which we may enter the League of Nations—I speak in substance only and in paraphrase—is by the election of Warren G. Harding as President of the United States. I said I did not believe it when they said it, and I am very glad to say we are still out of the League of Nations, although, Mr. President, we are approaching dangerously close in going into the World Court.

So much, sir, for the politics of this situation. It is not for us to trouble ourselves about that at all, but while upon it, because it was so interesting to me, let me read the resolution which was reported by the Massachusetts Legislature when George F. Hoar was standing in the Senate of the United States in opposition to the President and in opposition to his party.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in General Court assembled, That Massachusetts, ever loyal in sympathy and support of the General Government, continues her unabated confidence in her Senators, and with a just pride in the eloquent and memorable words they have uttered, leaves them untrammelled in the exercise of an independent and patriotic judgment upon the momentous questions presented for their consideration.*

O that we had more legislatures of that sort to-day; and, oh, sir, that we had more Senators like George F. Hoar in this body!

Here, sir, we come in this particular debate, if it be deemed appropriate, to a discussion more or less of the dangers of the court statute. I shall not, Mr. President, in detail at this time attempt a close analysis of the statute of the court, nor of the league at all. There is, however, one part of the subject concerning which a word may be quite appropriate.

Sanctions are something which in our Constitutional Convention, away back in 1787, we determined never to be a party to. Sanctions have something of a holy name, like "International World Court"; the word "sanctions" and the words "International World Court" rather go together. While it be true, sir, that in the statute of the World Court there is no provision whatever for sanctions, it is equally true that in the



League of Nations covenant there are ample provisions for just that thing.

Sanctions, sir, mean something beyond the benevolence of the pronouncement of the words. Sanctions, sir, mean either starving a people to death, starving them with a blockade, or whipping them with an army. Sanctions, sir, mean, after all, war, and sanctions, sir, may sometimes be put into operation, according to those who are best informed, to enforce the judgments of the International Court of Justice.

It is quite true that we are not a part of the league; it is quite true, sir, that sanctions we could avoid perhaps—I say only “perhaps”; we could avoid them by standing aloof—but it is equally true, sir, that if two nations, members of the league, have a judgment submitted concerning them and that judgment is denied by the one or is in some fashion resisted by the other, then the league, through its sanctions, may undertake the enforcement of that judgment. Bear in mind, sir, that means war. So out of this beatific and ethereal, this beneficent and mystical instrument called the protocol of the International Court of Justice, it is possible, sir, that war may emerge, and it is not only possible, sir, but it is quite likely that it may in some instance emerge.

But it is said, Mr. President, that we would not be a party to it. Legally, I admit it; but here are two nations of Europe, for instance, between whom there arises a controversy that threatens the peace of the world. Those two nations stand before the court; the court renders its decision. That means the peace of the world, let us say, for when they come to consider the decision ultimately one nation may be recalcitrant, it may decline absolutely to be bound, and goes its way, in war or otherwise. Then it is that the league may act, and then it is for the purpose of the preservation of the peace of the world that sanctions may be applied by the League of Nations, sanctions by means of which either the people of the recalcitrant state shall be starved or shall be beaten into submission by cannon and by the shedding of blood.

Then the United States of America, harbinger of peace on earth and the one great country with a moral obligation that is talked of so much, scoots across the sea and says, “The peace of the world being in danger we run and we are going to have nothing to do with it; we will not contribute to it in the slightest degree.” Nonsense, sir; nonsense; we never would act in that way, and we would not want our Nation to act in that way. We would do our part; we would play our part exactly as America ever has played her part and has ever done her duty. Sanctions, sir, says Mr. Hudson, are in these decisions. Sanctions, sir, says every individual familiar with the situation, are in these decisions. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in an article which he published in the Nation, said:

The League of Nations is a treaty or agreement between a large group of nations, and if they choose to enforce the judgments of this or any other court by sanctions, it is none of our affair.

In the name of God, why are we going there, then, if it is none of our affair? If the peace of the world is threatened, if sanctions are demanded by a league to enforce that peace under the decision of a court of which we are a part, tell me that it is none of our affair. Whence came that doctrine to the United States of America, and how long would the people of the United States of America tolerate that doctrine?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator think that we should now withdraw from The Hague Court of Arbitration for the reasons now suggested by the Senator from California?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not know what the Senator is talking about, Mr. President, and for that reason I do not intend to answer him.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask a question in reply?

Mr. JOHNSON. Surely.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator claim that The Hague Court of Arbitration pretends to enforce its decrees by sanctions, by arms—that it has any such authority, or that it ever has undertaken to assert it?

Mr. LENROOT. It has exactly the same authority that the Permanent Court of International Justice has. The sanctions that the Senator now refers to apply specifically to all awards, and therefore they apply to the court of arbitration at The Hague; and if the argument the Senator now makes is valid we should at once withdraw from The Hague court.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, no; I deny that statement, sir. I deny it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Of course they do not apply to The Hague court.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not intend to enter into a controversy with the Senator from Wisconsin on that point. I deny that the arbitration court of The Hague permits anything of the sort. It does not do anything of the kind, sir.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California further yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; I will yield no further. I want to conclude. The Senator will pardon me. I do not intend any impoliteness by not yielding to him, but I am very weary, and I want to finish if I can.

I desire, Mr. President, to present to you upon this question of sanctions something that has been said by Mr. Hudson. I quote Mr. Hudson because Mr. Hudson, after all, is the outstanding character in the matter of the advocacy of the court and in the matter of the advocacy of the League of Nations.

Mr. Hudson says:

The sanctions behind the court are those contained in the covenant, and if any state should fail to abide by a decision, it will be for the council of the league (under article 13 of the covenant) to “propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.”

Now, sanctions are behind the court's decisions, according to what Mr. Hudson says. Sanctions are behind the league provisions, we all know; and that these sanctions would be employed in case decisions should be rendered and there were recalcitrant states declining to carry out those decisions seems to me a matter which can not be doubted or questioned. To say to me that The Hague tribunal has exactly the same sanctions is to say to me something that I can not for an instant believe.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I will yield for a question.

Mr. LENROOT. I made no such statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. Then we do not differ. I am very glad.

Mr. LENROOT. I said the permanent court had no more sanctions than The Hague tribunal, and the Senator will not dispute that.

Mr. JOHNSON. The permanent court has no more sanctions than The Hague tribunal?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Hague tribunal has no sanctions.

Mr. LENROOT. And neither has this court.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; it has—yes; it has—yes; it has! It has the sanctions, as Mr. Hudson says, of the League of Nations behind it, and those sanctions may be starving a people or fighting a people into subjection; and when gentlemen stand here and say that if sanctions be employed it is none of our affair, I take issue with that statement. It is our affair. If we are to do aught that is of value to the world, if we seek at all the peace of humanity, to say that we will go into a court, and when war is imminent, and when it is possible that there may be strife between nations, that we will stand aside and say it is none of our affair, is to put this Nation in a position that no American ought to wish for it at all.

Mr. President, it was my intention to refer historically to much to-day and to some of the things that have gone before. I find that it is a matter of impossibility to continue at great length. I wish, however, sir, to say to our brethren upon this floor concerning what has transpired in this debate: Stop; pause for a moment; see whither you are going. Do you believe that you will stop short in this World Court when once you have entered it, and that no farther will you go? Do you imagine for a second that you can play the part that has been mapped out upon this floor for this Nation, once you enter that World Court? It is as certain as anything can be that entry into the court will take us farther along the path. If you want to go along that path, go along it; that is all right; but if you do not wish to do it, do not pretend that you are entering upon another path altogether and another scene altogether.

Mr. President, a century ago in this city this question was threshed out before the American people. A century ago in this city came the representative of the great Russian Czar. Came he for the purpose of taking the new young Republic into the Holy Alliance. Came he here with instructions to tell our people how the War of 1812 had demonstrated that no longer could America hold her position of aloofness in the world, but that any strife in the future meant that America would be involved.

I read the arguments of gentlemen upon the other side; I read those in the newspapers that are advocating this court; and I see that they are based upon the same premise, the same argument, to-day that the Russian Czar based his argument upon 100 years ago in asking us to join the Holy Alliance.



They say to us, Mr. President: "The World War has demonstrated that you must take part in world affairs. The World War has shown that no longer can there be strife on earth but that you are a party to that strife." They say to us now: "This war has demonstrated that you can not hold your position as you have held it in the past." That was said to us 100 years ago.

Oh, sirs, you upon this floor, read Doctor Cresson's little work here on The Holy Alliance and the Monroe Doctrine. Read old John Quincy Adams's words, then. Read Monroe's utterances. Read of those who were our statesmen in that day, who then mapped out the course of the American Republic that we have followed ever since.

I want to keep out of this mess, Mr. President, not because I say that we are better than the people abroad at all. I do not assert it in any aspect. We are different from those across the sea. We are different from them. Here we have a melting pot, Mr. President, that has not yet melted. Here, sir, we have different aspirations, different ideas, and different governmental policies than those people across the sea. There, between those nations, are shadowy boundaries which have been insufficient to stem the hatreds and the jealousies and the racial feuds of centuries. There, over across the sea, are united nationalities. Over here is a polyglot people. Take us over there into this court and into this league, take us across the sea into this maelstrom, and you not only have your difficulties there and your partisanship over there, but you bring upon us here the ills of the national groups that yet reside in the United States of America. It is because of that, for one reason, that I do not wish to dabble in that which we neither understand nor appreciate. It is because of that, for one reason, that I do not wish to go abroad and become a part of Europe's political life.

Can you stamp out nationalism abroad, Mr. President? Not a bit of it! You can no more stamp out patriotism abroad than, thank God, you can stamp it out in some people at home. Patriotism there means nationality. Nationality there means much to them. They believe, across the sea, in more peoples, more lands. We want neither. We covet no more peoples, we ask no more lands. They believe in imperialism. We do not. We have a set of interests different from theirs. Why leave our soil to stand upon theirs? Over there they have one common purpose. Oh, face the realities, you gentlemen here! Do you not realize what the situation is? No man who comes out of Europe to-day but understands it and will tell it to you. No secret is expressed when I say, however they may snarl at one another across the sea and however they may make faces across their shadowy boundaries, there is a common feeling with them all, a feeling of jealousy, distrust, suspicion, and hostility to the United States of America.

All over Europe that exists. You can not deny it. Whenever a creditor presses his debtor, it results. Not only does it result in this instance from that source, but it results from many, many years and from many, many incidents. A creditor nation pressing every other nation in Europe of power and of standing, and then we go into a court composed of judges from these very nations!

Nationalism you deny, in what terms you will, of this World Court. I have no disposition to say aught of ill concerning it or any man in it. Imagine the Italian judge, however, sitting upon that court, rendering a decision against Italy and Mussolini, and then going back to Italy, Mr. President! Nationalism there, sir, obtains—nationalism of a degree that perhaps we little comprehend—and nationalism will persist to the dawn of the new era.

In Europe since the war what do you observe? What is Europe since the war? What is it that has happened there? Are minorities cared for and weak nations protected? Not a bit of it, sir! A military dictator in Spain sets aside civil power. In Greece a militarist sits in power, and his own sweet will is the measure of the law for the people of that territory. In Italy there is an absolutism such as modern times never before have seen. Into this, with the representatives of some of these nations upon the court, you would take Uncle Sam, the creditor nation of the earth, and submit him to the judgment, perhaps, in some instances, of his debtors!

I have heard of men in the past who were debtors submitting themselves to the judgment of their creditors. I never yet heard of a creditor—you may say it is an impossibility, but possibilities of every sort may arise, sir—I never yet knew a creditor who submitted himself to the judgment of his debtors.

Take the United States into the court, thence into the league. I speak of going into the court and going into the league as one and the same thing, for I firmly believe that one means the other and that ultimately in the league we will find our-

selves embroiled in exactly that which we were warned against in the days of the old debate and that which we then escaped.

Mr. President, I recognize the patriotism of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber. I recognize that on this question it is no less fervid than my own. I recognize that they desire the right just as I desire the right. Oh, pray with me to the God of Hosts, the God who makes the fortunes of men and settles the destinies of nations, in this hour of our need, to take the right road for the United States of America!

Here we stand at the crossroads, Mr. President. Behind us is the illumined way that we have traveled for 140 years in the past. Behind us is this illumined way, every milestone marked by the blood of patriots and the wisdom of statesmen who have gone before. Ahead of us are the beckoning hands of those who guided our country's course along the road we have traveled these 140 years, traveled to our present eminence and our present greatness under the blessing of God. Let us continue upon that road in the days and the hours ahead of us.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. President, in my judgment the sober, second thought of the American people can always be trusted. Great and important questions should never be hastily determined. It has been a little more than six years since the armistice was signed. During this period the interest in world peace has not lessened, but has increased from day to day.

The necessity for some tribunal of international justice has been accepted with increasing force since the day the armistice was signed. At this time all people in this country are interested in and discussing this question. During the last five years this subject has been intensively studied and we may now feel that calm deliberation controls our thought. This international question has received the best thought of the most able and patriotic men and women of the United States.

It is important to dispel the erroneous impressions which sometimes appear to prevail concerning the so-called World Court. There is no opposition, in fact, to the establishment of a tribunal of justice to deal with international questions and with problems which might form the basis of controversy and terminate in actual conflict between nations. The only real difference of opinion that exists relates to the kind of a world court with which our country is willing to affiliate; or, stated differently, what reservations we must impose as a condition to our joining the other nations of the world in the establishment of such a court.

It is important, therefore, to first consider the exact language of the resolution which is now pending for consideration before this body. It reads:

Whereas the President, under date of February 23, 1923, transmitted a message to the Senate accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of State, dated February 17, 1923, asking the favorable advice and consent of the Senate to the adhesion on the part of the United States to the protocol of December 18, 1920, of signature of the statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice, set out in the said message of the President (without accepting or agreeing to the optional clause for compulsory jurisdiction contained therein), upon the conditions and understandings hereafter stated, to be made a part of the instrument of adhesion: Therefore be it

*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring),* That the Senate advise and consent to the adhesion on the part of the United States to the said protocol of December 18, 1920, and the adjoined statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice (without accepting or agreeing to the optional clause for compulsory jurisdiction contained in said statute), and that the signature of the United States be affixed to the said protocol, subject to the following reservations and understandings, which are hereby made a part and condition of this resolution, namely:

1. That such adhesion shall not be taken to involve any legal relation on the part of the United States to the League of Nations or the assumption of any obligations by the United States under the covenant of the League of Nations constituting part 1 of the treaty of Versailles.

2. That the United States shall be permitted to participate through representatives designated for the purpose and upon an equality with the other States, members, respectively, of the Council and Assembly of the League of Nations, in any and all proceedings of either the council or the assembly for the election of judges or deputy judges of the Permanent Court of International Justice or for the filling of vacancies.

3. That the United States will pay a fair share of the expenses of the court as determined and appropriated from time to time by the Congress of the United States.

4. That the statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice adjoined to the protocol shall not be amended without the consent of the United States.

5. That the United States shall be in no manner bound by any advisory opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice not



rendered pursuant to a request in which it, the United States, shall expressly join in accordance with the statute for the said court adjoined to the protocol of signature of the same to which the United States shall become signatory.

The signature of the United States to the said protocol shall not be affixed until the powers signatory to such protocol shall have indicated, through an exchange of notes, their acceptance of the foregoing reservations and understandings as a part and a condition of adhesion by the United States to the said protocol.

A world court tribunal was formally indorsed by the Republican Party at its national convention in Cleveland in 1924. The party platform provides, however, that affiliation with such a tribunal should be made only upon the conditions embodied in the following reservations:

First. That by supporting the court we do not assume any obligations under the league.

Second. That we participate upon an equality with other States in the election of judges.

Third. That the Congress shall determine what part of the expenses we shall bear.

Fourth. That the statute creating the court shall not be amended without our consent.

President Coolidge in his message to the present Congress suggested the adoption of the foregoing reservations, and as a further safeguard President Coolidge suggested the following additional condition and reservation:

That we are not to be bound by advisory opinions rendered without our consent.

As a Republican, therefore, I have the formal declaration of the party platform expressing the conditions upon which this resolution be adopted. With the declaration of my party and the suggestions of the President of the United States, elected upon that platform by a majority of 7,000,000, I am in entire harmony and accord. The additional reservation suggested by President Coolidge, in my judgment, removes any objection which might remain to the action of this Government in joining with the other civilized nations of the world in creating a world tribunal to promote peace.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] proposes the following reservations as the conditions under which the resolution before us be adopted:

First. That the league impose no new duties on the court unless the statute itself is amended and this action ratified by every power signatory to the protocol.

Second. That adherence of the United States to the statute is conditioned on the understanding that no force or economic sanction shall at any time be employed to enforce the court's decrees or opinions.

Third. That American adherence be conditioned further on the understanding that no section of the statute shall ever be construed as to require the United States to depart from its traditional policy of not entangling itself with Europe's political questions, nor shall anything in the statute be construed as to imply relinquishment by the United States of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

It will be seen that there is no startling or irreconcilable conflict between the reservations suggested in the platform of the Republican Party and by President Coolidge, and those proposed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. It is more a difference in language than in spirit. In both cases the reservations are proposed to prevent our becoming involved in entangling political alliances in Europe, and to preserve our own right to independent action against European interference in our affairs.

Our form of government compels the ultimate compromise of opinion upon mere form, in order to reach the substance, upon any great question. The differences here are more in form than substance. Yet the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is by the press often quoted as being opposed to the principle of the organization of any international tribunal to promote world peace. In that regard he is, of course, misquoted. We are all actuated by the same purpose, and are striving to attain the same ultimate end. We want to preserve our own right of independent action, and yet we are not willing to lend our moral support to any great tribunal for world peace.

For myself, I am constrained to follow the mandate of my party platform and the leadership of President Coolidge, rather than undertake to suggest in some modified language another method of reaching the same end. The platform of the Republican Party, with the additional safeguard proposed in the additional reservation suggested by President Coolidge in his annual message, which I have heretofore quoted, appeal to me as proper guidance in the discharge of my duty and the recording of my vote in this body upon the proposition of creating a tribunal to promote peace in the world.

While we must here register our personal views and convictions, yet mindful of the value of the deliberate opinion of the people of the country, expressed after due deliberation and upon sober second thought, I deem it appropriate to here call attention to the expressions of approval by various groups of our citizens, and by men recognized as safe and sound leaders of public thought. The groups and organizations that have spoken on this subject in this country may be roughly divided into three classes.

First I would mention those of a religious character as expressing the thought of various groups of religious thought. Practically every religious denomination, through their respective governing bodies, have voiced their approval in formal communications to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; all of them have urged our entrance into a world tribunal to promote peace.

The Northern Baptist Convention, which comprises a membership of about a million and a quarter people, presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs this resolution:

*Resolved*, That we urge the administration at Washington to effect such international agreement as shall enable us to put the strength of our wisdom and experience at the service of humanity.

The resolution further expressed approval of the efforts made by the President in urging our joining a world court.

The National Council of the Episcopal Church submitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs a resolution adopted by that body, the language of which is:

*Be it resolved*, That this council indorses the recommendation of our late President that the United States become a constituent of the World Court under the reservations suggested by him; and

*Resolved further*, That this council urges on all members of the church the duty of prayer for this great step for world peace, of study, and of action in its behalf.

Dr. Sidney L. Gulick presented the following memorial to the United States Senate:

*Resolved*, That the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in annual meeting assembled, hereby reaffirms the action of the officers of the Federal council in expressing to President Coolidge, on behalf of the churches, appreciation of his advocacy in his message to the Senate on December 6, 1923, of American membership in the Permanent Court of International Justice.

We warmly indorse the declarations of the late President Harding and of President Coolidge that this matter is not a partisan issue. It should not, we believe, be made one. We respectfully convey to the President and to the Senate of the United States the earnest desire of the constituency of this council that the Senate take speedy and favorable action on the recommendation of the President.

The Rev. Dr. Arthur J. Brown, as the representative of the Presbyterian Board of Missions, personally appeared before the committee in support of this measure.

Dr. Samuel A. Chester appeared, representing the Southern Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Jason Noble Pierce represented the Congregational Churches and presented their resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the National Council of Congregational Churches that our Nation should arise above political partisanship in its international relation, and that the world situation demands that America proceed at once to enter into the World Court, which was urged upon the people as a present opportunity and duty by President Harding in his last journey.

Also appeared before the committee Mr. J. Henry Scattergood, representing the Society of Friends; also Rabbi Abram Simon, representing the Central Conference of American Rabbis. These and many others, representative of the religious thought of the country, urged upon the committee favorable action upon the resolution under consideration.

Among the additional religious groups who have urged favorable action on this resolution are—

Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania.  
The Union Ministers' Meeting.  
American Unitarian Association.  
National Board of Young Women's Christian Association.  
United Society for Christian Endeavor.  
Baptist World Alliance.  
World Christian Citizens' Conference.  
International Missionary Union.  
Women's Missionary Union of Friends in America.  
The Methodist Episcopal Clergy Annual Conference Church Peace Union (a seminary organization).

Next I would call attention to groups which may be more properly termed secular in character. From the following



groups of this character representatives appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

The National Chamber of Commerce.  
American Federation of Labor.  
American Bar Association.  
National Association of Credit Men.  
National League of Women Voters.  
American Association of University Women.  
The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.  
National Council of Women.  
World Peace Foundation.  
American Federation of Teachers.  
National Service Star Legion.  
National Council of Jewish Women.  
Girls' Friendly Society of America.  
National Congress of Mothers and Parent Teachers' Association.  
All Nations' Association.  
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.  
New York Council for International Cooperation to Prevent War.  
Association to Abolish War.

The foregoing are representative and typical of the solemn and considerate thought of outstanding groups among our people upon this subject.

Perhaps we may not indorse all that has been said by individual men and women or by organizations in favor of international affiliations. I, myself, can not go as far as many of our great educational leaders and representative groups have gone by way of encouragement toward affiliations that might lead to entangling alliances; I can not indorse all they have said about our entering into active participation in world affairs. Certainly I can not agree with those who would have us become involved in world politics.

However, consideration should be given to the declarations of students of history; their opinions should be received, and in so far as they give promise of practical application in our desire to provide some method of promoting peace, we may well profit by their suggestions.

Among the outstanding leaders of thought advocating a so-called world court we can mention with confidence such men as former Presidents Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, and Harding. To these I would add such men as Elihu Root and Charles E. Hughes.

Even with the support and indorsement of the men and women, and groups of men and women above enumerated, I would still be hesitant to unqualifiedly assert that the sober second thought of our people is settled in favor of this resolution.

But there exists in this country a third group of citizens, to whose voice upon this subject we have no right to turn a deaf ear; rather, we should eagerly and unhesitatingly accept their verdict as sound and of controlling importance. I refer to that group of our citizens who were willing to die for their country and who offered themselves as willing to make the supreme sacrifice to save civilization.

Four millions of the flower of our land cheerfully responded in the great crisis of the World War. These men, having experienced the horrors of war, fully realize the importance of the preservation of peace. Nobody can assert that they could be influenced by any false ideas concerning foreign entanglements. Their verdict and judgment may be most safely relied upon as purely patriotic. They are led by no false ideals; they cherish no foolish antagonisms; they simply speak from experience.

The American Legion at their convention in Omaha last October adopted a resolution urging—

the immediate adherence by the United States to a permanent court of international justice.

The Legion did not stop with this simple declaration, but by formal resolution declared:

This should be the chief objective of Legion peace activities and every influence and power of the Legion should be exerted to press the matter to a favorable vote in the United States Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Fortified, therefore, by the expressed opinion of the great religious groups in America and of the most prominent secular organizations, some of which I have before enumerated, when the American Legion, as the representative of the patriotic spirit of the country, speaking seven years after the armistice, names as the chief objective of their peace activities the use of their influence with this body to secure a favorable vote to promote peace, by the adoption of the resolution now under consideration with these essential reservations, I am moved to agreement with their sober and considerate judgment.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKINLEY. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator claim that this resolution represents the sentiment of the American Legion? Does he not know, as a matter of fact, that Legion post after Legion post have protested against our adherence to this World Court?

Mr. McKINLEY. I do not know. I have quoted the resolution passed in their national convention.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I happen to know that.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. President, if a fear be entertained that the United States may become involved in European troubles, surely the speech delivered by our Secretary of State in New York on December 14, voicing the sentiments of President Coolidge, should dispel their misgivings. At that time he declared that it has been the settled policy of the United States not to interfere in purely European questions, and we here protect and preserve our American doctrine that the European nations shall not interfere in our affairs.

Secretary Kellogg said in the address referred to:

We shall go to the very limit of reasonable cooperation for all legitimate purposes, but we will not commit ourselves to the European system of alliances and counteralliances to maintain the balance of power upon that continent.

In conclusion, I am moved to suggest the fact that in centuries past most wars have developed from the ambitions and antagonisms of czars and emperors, whose power over their subjects enabled them to declare war. The World War has eliminated all czars and emperors, and particularly in western Europe, in the countries with which the United States is in close touch, the people are in control of their governments, and can dictate a warlike or a peaceful policy. The people in these countries are weary of war. This is evidenced particularly by their prompt acceptance of the Dawes plan and of the recently signed Locarno pact.

Europe needs our moral support. There were some of our citizens who feared the consequences of sending to the war-ridden nations of Europe the services of an unofficial commission, voluntarily tendered, to render possible aid in the solution of their economic problems. We all remember how eagerly they accepted the judgment and suggestions of this unbiased and disinterested commission from the United States. Being satisfied of our fairness and lack of prejudice, and with the sincerity of our motives to lend our moral support to the establishment of sound economic policies, the Dawes plan was promptly accepted, and is to-day acclaimed one of the triumphs of American statesmanship and diplomacy.

The Locarno pact is no theoretical proposition, but is an agreement entered into by the five great nations of Europe; those nations at this time have the ability to enforce their wishes. It should be remembered that 50 years ago there were two similar agreements, one entered into by Germany, Italy, and Austria and the other included the nations of France, England, and Russia. Austria has been dismembered and does not count; the conditions in Russia appear to be chaotic; but the other four nations who were in the agreement of 50 years ago, arrayed on opposite sides and in antagonistic groups, are now combined into an agreement to maintain world peace, and for a considerable period I think they will do so.

Just as Europe asked our moral support, which brought about the adoption of the Dawes plan, so now they are asking our moral support in the proposition for a so-called world court to promote peace.

With the Coolidge reservations, such a court of peace will involve America in no entangling alliances. In a word, to sum it all up, the World Court can do America no harm, and may do the world some good. It is not a contract, but rather a peaceful gesture. It is not an entangling alliance, but a friendly cooperation. It is just a step in the right direction.

It is the duty of America to do what it can to preserve the peace of the world. Surely no civilized people can refuse to help. If peace reigns in Europe, if business there returns to normal, if their purchasing power is regained, then our American surplus of corn, cotton, wheat, and manufactured products will find a growing market.

The World Court resolution as now proposed has been amended in every way to protect American independence in the consideration of purely American questions; in the selection of judges, in the payment of expense, in the equality of votes, in the submission of disputes, in the matter of foreign questions in which America would have no place and no interest. All these matters have been given attention.



There is nothing to fear! There is nothing to lose! And perhaps permanent world peace to gain!

From every standpoint of both cold business and warm humanitarian interest the American Republic should take its place in this new movement and this new hope for "Peace on earth, good will to men."

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the human race is indebted to the great men who have worked here. The men of vision, the men who have wrought well in their day and generation are entitled to our esteem and reverence. I have in mind one of the greatest Presidents that the United States has ever had. I refer to Woodrow Wilson. Upon two occasions recently I have heard the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] attack and criticize him. At the same time he eulogized Mr. Lodge. He praised Mr. Lodge for helping to defeat the League of Nations. The Senator from South Carolina evidently did not know that Mr. Lodge favored a league of nations or a world court of some kind. In a speech made in the State of Massachusetts in 1915 Mr. Lodge used this language:

If we have reached the limit of voluntary arbitration what is the next step? I think the next step is that which this league proposes, and that is to put force behind international peace. We may not solve it in that way, but if we can not solve it in that way it can be solved in no other way.

The former Senator from Massachusetts opposed the League of Nations. He probably did more than any other one man to defeat it. The former Senator from Massachusetts changed his position entirely, as the record will show and as the debates here upon the League of Nations will show. The former Senator from Massachusetts, just three years before the League of Nations treaty was defeated, favored a league backed by force and he favored this Government being a member of such a league.

The Senator from South Carolina in his attack upon President Wilson, rather contrasting him with Mr. Lodge, praised Mr. Lodge exceedingly. I served with Senator Lodge in this body. He was a very cultured and scholarly man. He was a very cold man. He was a man who had no very warm friendships. I always had the impression, as others had, that he was exceedingly jealous of President Wilson, envious of his scholarship, of his learning, of his masterly manner of presenting questions in which he was interested, and of the intellectual superiority that people generally recognize in him over most of his fellows.

Upon a former occasion a Senator who served in this body who is not now here criticized President Wilson severely, and I stated upon the floor of the Senate at that time that I would not permit anybody to assault unjustly this great man, who could not be here to speak for himself, without replying to such an attack.

The Senator from South Carolina entered into a eulogy upon Senator Lodge while he was attacking in the same breath the martyred President of the United States. While he was praising Senator Lodge I could but think of and contrast the service of the two to the South, to the section from which the Senator from South Carolina hails. One of them, the Senator from Massachusetts, when a Member of the House, introduced a bill known as the force bill. The greatest filibuster in the history of this body was conducted to defeat that bill, and succeeded in doing so. If that bill had been enacted into law, soldiers would have gone to every polling place in the South—in South Carolina, in Alabama. At all the voting precincts in the South they would have stood with their bayonets and they would have controlled the elections by force. They would have permitted negroes, drunk on their new-found freedom and led on by scalawags and carpetbaggers, to have overthrown the civilization of the South. All that was dear to us was at stake. And yet the Senator from South Carolina has eulogized Mr. Lodge as one of the greatest Americans and has criticized and condemned President Wilson.

What did President Wilson do for the South? Born in Virginia, in the first place, he placed in his Cabinet four southern men when he was President. He did all that he could to relieve that people, not yet recovered entirely from the evil effects of the war of 1860 and the reign of the carpetbagger and the scalawag, always encouraging and trying to help us up and relieve us of the burdens that long rested upon us. I was utterly astounded at the speech of the Senator from South Carolina when he attacked this great man and eulogized the man who undertook during his service at this Capital, by one of the most dangerous outstanding acts in his career, to wipe out and destroy the Anglo-Saxon civilization of the South.

I refer to these things because they are matters of record, and I want the record to remain straight. The Senator from South Carolina is entitled to his opinion about President

Wilson, but when he comes into this body and undertakes to express that opinion somebody is going to reply to him, if I have to do it myself.

In contrast with what this Senator, who claims to be a Democrat from South Carolina, has said about Mr. Wilson, I want to read what the present President of the United States said about this great man when he went to his last sleep:

As President of the United States he was moved by an earnest desire to promote the best interests of the country as he conceived them. His acts were prompted by high motives and his sincerity of purpose can not be questioned. He led the Nation through the terrific struggle of the World War with a lofty idealism which never failed him. He gave utterance to the aspirations of humanity with an eloquence which held the attention of all the earth and made America a new and enlarged influence in the destiny of mankind.

I submit that statement against the attacks of the Senator from South Carolina. That statement was made by Calvin Coolidge.

I hold in my hand the address delivered at the memorial exercises in the House by Doctor Alderman, of Virginia, another southerner. I prefer to quote him and to read what he has to say than to listen to the attacks of the Senator from South Carolina upon this great man. He quoted President Wilson:

What a man ought never to forget with regard to a college—

He once said at Swarthmore—

is that it is a nursery of honor and principle.

Then he said of President Wilson when president of Princeton:

He inaugurated new principles of educational contact, which now lie at the core of the development, not alone of his own university but of all the institutions of liberal culture in his country.

It seems that this man of very high culture and broad learning differs very much with the Senator from South Carolina in his opinion of this great scholar and statesman. Proceeding in his speech Doctor Alderman said:

Woodrow Wilson had the impulse to write as well as to talk and became a writer of eminence fit to claim a place in the literature of his country along with Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, and Roosevelt.

Does a man of that character deserve the attack made upon him which was made by the Senator from South Carolina? Doctor Alderman quotes Mr. Wilson again. Mr. Wilson said:

It is not knowledge that moves the world, but ideals, convictions, the opinions or fancies that have been held or followed; and whoever studies humanity ought to study it alive, practice the vivisection of reading literature, and acquaint himself with something more than anatomies which are no longer in use by spirits.

I commend that to the Senators who are harking back to things of a hundred years ago and more, and who seem to have no vision of the present, or of the things that are to come. Again, Doctor Alderman compliments Mr. Wilson:

I can not, at this time and place, attempt even to enumerate the legislative measures which, under his leadership, went forward in the Sixty-third Congress; but I venture to claim that no such well thought out program of financial, social, and industrial reform, no such inspiring spectacle of governmental efficiency and concentrated energy, no such display of fearless devotion to public interests, moving high above the plane of partisan advantage or of private gain, has been spread before the eyes of this generation as is afforded by the list of enduring enactments which crowned the accession to power of Woodrow Wilson.

There is quite a difference of opinion between these two distinguished southerners. Referring to Mr. Wilson, at about the time when the war was nearing the close, Doctor Alderman said:

Still preoccupied with the thought of lasting peace, Mr. Wilson appeared before the Congress in the early winter of 1918, at the darkest moment of the allied fortunes, and formulated 14 points of peace. These generalizations were almost revolutionary in their scope and idealism and ultimately formed the general basis of the peace to be drafted; but they carried, too, a political adroitness aiming directly at putting an end to the fighting. They planted new seeds of aspiration and new hopes of justice between nations in the minds of men; and it is not easy to ostracize such ideas. Its timeliness, as well as its strength, gives to this document a place among the great charters which have marked the progress of mankind.

I commend these statements to the Senator from South Carolina.



This paper, and the complimentary addresses following it, aimed at nothing less than to endow the broken and weary nations with a new order and a new life. Desperate peoples for an hour looked into the shining face of Hope, and had sight of an old heaven and a new earth arising out of horror but ennobled by the self-sacrifice of millions. In Burke's vivid phrase, he was now the Lord of the Ascendant; his speeches had the strength of battalions along the front of battle; his voice was the voice of free peoples; and all over the earth, in the great capitals, among the tribes of the desert, in the islands of the sea, men felt the molding of his thought and sensed the grandeur of his aims.

I submit that a man of that character should not be attacked by anybody in this body, much less by one who hails from the section of the country that gave Mr. Wilson birth. Doctor Alderman goes on to say:

The genius of the Army and Navy displayed itself in war. The genius of the President struck down the enemy morale and laid the foundations of peace.

That is literally true, Mr. President, as all of us who knew this man and knew what he was doing during the war know. Doctor Alderman refers here to language used by President Roosevelt:

In 1910, in his Nobel lecture, Theodore Roosevelt himself said:

"It would be a master stroke if those great powers honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace not only to keep the peace among themselves but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others. The man or statesman who should bring about such a condition would have earned his place in history for all time and his title to the gratitude of all mankind."

The then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, favored such a course as Mr. Wilson was pursuing; Mr. Roosevelt favored such a course; he pointed it out before Mr. Wilson became President, and told how the world should be grateful to a man who would lead the way to universal peace; but the Senator from South Carolina criticizes and condemns President Wilson for trying to bring about universal peace. Again Doctor Alderman says, referring to Mr. Wilson's tour of the West, when the League of Nations was before the Senate for consideration:

There is no series of political speeches, made under circumstances of such strain, in our annals attaining a higher level of oratory and exposition. He was forewarned, as he fared forth, that his life might be the forfeit of his enterprise. He replied, "I would forfeit my life to attain the end I seek," and he meant it; for he was incapable of melodramatic pose, and the consecration of that statement runs like a thread of gold through the sustained appeal.

Mr. President, that statement is not overdrawn. President Wilson was a man of that character, of that heroic mold that if he believed in anything that affected mankind he believed in it so strongly that he would be willing to die for his convictions. That is more than I can say of a good many public men that I have known in my day and generation. Doctor Alderman continues:

Woodrow Wilson fell stricken as if in battle at Pueblo, Colo., on September 25, 1919, and came home shorn of his unmatched strength to persuade and move the hearts of his countrymen.

The last words spoken to the people at Pueblo by the President were these: "Now that the mists of this great question have cleared away, I believe that men will see the truth, eye to eye and face to face. There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice, liberty, and peace. We have accepted that truth, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world out into pastures of quietness and peace such as this world never dreamed of before."

What a glorious vision, Mr. President, for any man, be he Republican or Democrat, who is striving for the day when out of the clash of arms and the iron storm of war shall come peace universal! But this man is criticized by the Senator from South Carolina because of his activities even in the World War and especially because of his activities to clinch the result of the World War, and after helping to put war down to provide some way to keep war down.

Doctor Alderman continues:

Posterity will be eager to have knowledge of the personality and the salient qualities of a statesman set apart to play such a rôle in the world's affairs. I shall picture him as I knew him—not the Wilson whom mankind will remember as the stern war leader of a mighty nation, but another Wilson, known to me—a Wilson of sprightliness and humor and handsome courtesy, of kindly countenance and fascinating conversation, with power to "beguile you into being informed beyond your worth and wise beyond your birthright."

I commend that to my friend from South Carolina.

Woodrow Wilson was a deeply religious man. Men who do not understand the religious spirit need not even try to understand him.

I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina was in mind when that sentence was uttered.

No man in supreme power in any nation's life, since Gladstone, was so profoundly penetrated by the Christian faith. He was sturdily and mystically Christian. He took God Almighty in earnest as the Supreme Reality, and he carried Him into his home and saw His immanence and guidance in private and public life. He had the habit of prayer, and he read and reread the English Bible. Through all his speeches flamed the glory of an insistent belief that morality and politics should march hand in hand. Many of his tendencies, perhaps the most of them that occasioned debate and censure, sprang from his pragmatic belief in God.

Wilson could be, and sometimes was, aloof and unrelenting to this or that friend or foe; but mankind, in the mass, never failed to soften his spirit and awaken his emotions. He would have gone to the stake to protect mankind, as a whole, from tyranny and injustice.

Mr. President, he served his day and generation well, but he is gone. Dead because of the fight that he made to promote peace and prevent war. I do not intend that anybody shall assail him so long as I am a Member of this body without rising and saying something in his behalf. Not that he needs any defense from me or from anyone else, but I just want the people who read the RECORD which goes out of this body to see that we reverence and love Woodrow Wilson here. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], a Republican, the very day before the Senator from South Carolina attacked him, paid him a tribute in this body. I wanted the RECORD to show just what the situation is here as to the regard in which the memory of Woodrow Wilson is held.

Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] made a very strong speech for his side of this proposition. If he understands this question, and if he has properly presented it, there is nothing to the position of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. The Senator from Idaho has argued here for hours that this court can drag us in and take jurisdiction over us, and the Senator from California holds that the court has no power to take us in or to exercise jurisdiction over us unless we consent. That is my position, so the Senator from California and I are agreed. It is simply a place where nations can go who want to arbitrate their differences. One side can go to it and ask to have a matter arbitrated, and the court would simply say, "Is the other side willing?" "I do not think so." "Then we have no jurisdiction over the matter."

Did you ever hear of a case being arbitrated in a community—and they are being arbitrated throughout the country to-day by the hundreds and the thousands—except where both parties agreed to it? Certainly not. Both sides come up to the arbitration board agreed on, and both sides agree to submit their cause, and to be bound by the judgment that is rendered. We are doing that in common practice throughout the United States to-day, and have done it since we have been in existence as a nation. Are we quarreling with the World Court because it is putting into practice things that we originated, that we have had in practice here since the Government was organized?

"Well, but," they say, "it is not any account, then, if it has no power." Mr. President, it is. Any place created and kept in existence to watch the operations of the nations of the earth, to watch nations contriving to start a war that will involve, perhaps, the whole world, to cry out against it, to cause publicity to be given and let the world begin to use its influence, not after they are out fighting but before hostilities begin, in order to prevent fighting, is a mighty good international institution to have.

The Senator from California described how Democrats would laugh when they got this thing over. Why, this World Court is not altogether what I want. I am frank to say that I am not entirely satisfied with it; but it is the only thing that is submitted to us. It is the best thing in sight, and a Republican President has recommended it in three of his messages.

I want to read to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] what Mr. Coolidge, the Republican President, says:

Our foreign policy has always been guided by two principles. The one is the avoidance of permanent political alliances which would sacrifice our proper independence. The other is the peaceful settlement of controversies between nations. By example and by treaty we have advocated arbitration. For nearly 25 years we have been a

member of The Hague Tribunal, and have long sought the creation of a permanent world court of justice. I am in full accord with both of these policies.

That is what President Coolidge said in 1923. Here is what he said in 1924. He is still following that up. He is the President of the party of the Senator from California:

America has been one of the foremost nations in advocating tribunals for the settlement of international disputes of a justiciable character. Our representatives took a leading part in those conferences which resulted in the establishment of The Hague tribunal and later in providing for a Permanent Court of International Justice. I believe it would be for the advantage of this country and helpful to the stability of other nations for us to adhere to the protocol establishing that court upon the conditions stated in the recommendation which is now before the Senate, and further, that our country shall not be bound by advisory opinions which may be rendered by the court upon questions which we have not voluntarily submitted for its judgment. This court would provide a practical and convenient tribunal before which we could go voluntarily, but to which we could not be summoned, for a determination of justiciable questions when they fall to be resolved by diplomatic negotiations.

Mr. President, I have to take a choice here between the Senator from California and the gentleman selected by the whole people of the United States to be President of my country. He is charged as Chief Executive with the responsibility of looking after the affairs of the Government, and while he belongs to another party he is President of the United States, and he has certainly informed himself upon this great question. He comes here and says that this is the kind of a court he wants, and the Senator from California says that what the President says about the court is true; that they can not bring us to it, but that we can go to it if we so desire.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Would the Senator be willing to go into the court if he were convinced that it did have a jurisdiction to decide cases which concerned the United States, and to do so without our consent?

Mr. HEFLIN. I would vote for a reservation to prevent that, and I am going to do so.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; but the question is this: The Senator states that he is for the court because it has no jurisdiction except that to which we voluntarily assent. I am asking the Senator if he would be willing to go into the court if he were convinced that the court does have or can obtain a jurisdiction to decide cases which concern the United States, and to do so without our consent?

Mr. HEFLIN. I hold that the court can not do that now; but I am going to vote for a reservation offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], which will be adopted, which specifically provides that this court shall have no jurisdiction over any case in which the United States is interested unless this Government consents that it may do so. Furthermore, it was agreed yesterday in debate, as I understood the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], that at any time that this court violates the spirit of our entrance into it the Congress can pass an act withdrawing from it. Does the Senator agree to that?

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; I do not agree to it unless we make it part of the very terms of our entrance. That, however, is not the question I am trying to get my friend to answer; and I am asking this question in no captious way, as he certainly knows.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand. I have already answered the question in my own way.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not think the Senator has quite answered it. If the Senator were convinced that notwithstanding the reservations which may be adopted the court nevertheless can obtain a jurisdiction which will enable it without our consent to decide questions of importance to the United States would he be willing that the United States should then take membership upon the court?

Mr. HEFLIN. I deny that the court ever can have such authority. This court can not have any authority over us except the authority that we give it, so the Senator's question does not fit the situation at all.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If the Senator will do me the favor of listening when I reach that part of my address—

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not think I will ask him to listen to all of it; but if he will listen to that part of it, I think I can absolutely demonstrate that the court as consti-

tuted has a jurisdiction to decide questions of vital importance to the United States without the United States being a party and without the United States consenting.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. CARAWAY. In that case it can do it whether we adhere or do not adhere, can it not?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Technically, yes; but if we sit on the court and take part in its deliberations, and recognize it, we are in a very different situation than if we sit outside of it and say that it is what it in fact is—merely a foreign tribunal set up by foreign nations. Then we will be in a very different situation.

Mr. CARAWAY. If we go into the court with an express reservation that it shall have no jurisdiction to determine any question in which we are interested without our consent, does the Senator think that will leave us more prejudiced by its decision than if it should decide when we are out of the court?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think unquestionably so.

Mr. CARAWAY. In what way?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Because if we go into this court, and recognize it as having authority—

Mr. CARAWAY. We can not destroy it by simply staying out.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; but we can ignore it by staying out.

Mr. CARAWAY. It will have the same—

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator does not let me answer.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I did not intend to speak very long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield further; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well. I think perhaps the colloquy has gone far enough.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for just a suggestion?

Mr. HEFLIN. Just a suggestion.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator from Alabama, and for my own enlightenment, that I should like to know whether the Senator from Missouri contemplated including within his question matters of domestic concern, so recognized by nations? May I say to the Senator that there are many Americans who believe in a court that has compulsory jurisdiction, excepting, of course, questions of a domestic character. Speaking for myself, I should like to see an international court that had compulsory jurisdiction to handle and decide international questions, but, of course, never to infringe domestic questions which belong to the states themselves.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator indulge me long enough to ask my friend—

Mr. KING. I do not have the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I simply wish to ask my friend if he is willing to have an international court with the jurisdiction to decide all international questions and enforce its decisions?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will indulge me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. KING. I believe in an international court such as was envisaged in the discussions of The Hague conferences. I am in favor of an international court created by treaty, with jurisdiction clearly defined and before which a state may be required to appear upon complaint of another member of the court, in order that a controversy of an international character may be considered and adjudicated. I do not object to what is called compulsory jurisdiction with respect to international questions. Nor am I now referring to the present court, although I do not mean to infer that it is not an international court; and, of course, I do not mean that domestic questions should be taken cognizance of by the World Court or any international tribunal.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me once more?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama further yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I understand the Senator, then, to say that he is in favor of a court that can summon before it



the nations of the earth and can take jurisdiction of international disputes. Is the Senator willing, then, that that court shall be empowered to enforce its decrees?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I can not yield to a Senator to ask another Senator a question and then to answer him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield further.

Mr. HEFLIN. I should be glad to hear my good friend from Missouri ask these questions and to hear my good friend from Utah answer them; but I do not intend to talk very much longer, and I want to hear what the Senator from Missouri has to say, because I think I will make a speech on this subject before the vote is taken. I am just touching now on some things that need clearing up.

Senators who oppose the World Court talk about propaganda. The documents I have received against the World Court cost more money to send out than those I have received in favor of it. Some of them are great big pamphlets, costing, I am sure, hundreds of thousands of dollars to print. They have flooded the Capitol with them. Who is back of that propaganda and who are the men here supporting the World Court? I do not mean to say that the gentlemen who are opposing it are not just as clever and as honest and as conscientious as we are, but there is no partisanship in this fight, so far as I can see. There is none in it with me. I am willing to take the suggestion of a Republican President and to go along with Republican Senators if I can by so doing get closer to world peace.

I am weary of a situation where Senators who stood here in the other fight and fought to the death the League of Nations, a Democratic proposal, and who intimated in those days that if they could get up some other plan they would do what they could for peace, now, when a Republican comes along with a mild-mannered proposition called the World Court, find fault with that, and go to beating that about, but have not a single suggestion to offer in the place of either one of them.

That is not constructive statesmanship. They remind me of the two Dagoes going up the street. They met a man who asked them where the macaroni factory was, and they told him they did not know. They walked about two blocks, when one of them said to the other one, "He does not want the macaroni factory. He means noodle factory." The other one said "Sure." They said, "Let's go back and overtake him." They followed him four blocks back and overtook him, and said, "You did not mean macaroni factory. You meant noodle factory." He said, "That's right, I did." They said, "Well, we don't know where that is, either." [Laughter.]

That is the situation we find here. It is easy to get up here and go to pounding around and beating on something. But what have they to offer in its stead? Do not Senators think that foreign nations are sincerely striving for world peace?

There are yet to be seen widows and orphans in the war-stricken countries. There is still suffering over there because of the war. Senators say those nations are not after anything except to get the United States in.

Talk about propaganda! The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] said that he had gotten letters from children. God knows they have as much right to demand that war be stopped as anybody, and maybe more. Some of them in this country miss their fathers now, fathers killed on the battle field in France. Why have they not a right to appeal? Why should not a little child, who is told that its father will never come back, that its father died in battle, was killed in the war, appeal to Senators? Such a child ought to hate war as long as he or she lives. The opponents of this court make light of the fact that these children in 300,000 homes should write to Senators and ask them to help prevent war. They laugh at it.

The Washington Post had a cartoon some time ago showing a little girl writing a note to a Senator asking him to please vote for a World Court, the cartoon making fun of it. Christ said:

Suffer little children to come unto Me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.

He said at another time:

A little child shall lead them.

I suggest to the Senator from California and to other Senators that it would be well to let these little children lead them into the paths of peace.

The Senator from California said, quoting Madison, I believe, "Who serves his country best serves his party best." I sincerely believe that I am working to the highest and best interests of every man, woman, and child in my country, including the Senators who oppose this World Court, when

I stand here and work for an international tribunal to promote peace and prevent war.

Mistakes have been made by public men in the past. Patrick Henry, one of the ablest men the country ever produced, one of the honored oratorical landmarks of the Republic, his speeches spoken in every schoolhouse in the country, one of the most brilliant orators of colonial days, stood up in the convention and fought the Constitution, and he predicted that dire disaster would come if we ever had a general Government and ever adopted that Constitution. He was mistaken; that is all. His vision was not good in that particular. He was sincere in what he was doing, but he was attacking what Gladstone said was the greatest civic document ever emanating from the brain of man. It is now the Constitution, the organic structure of the greatest Government on the globe, written by Mr. Madison, of Virginia.

These Senators who are attacking the World Court, and who are telling us what dire things will follow, are just as much mistaken as Patrick Henry was. They no doubt are conscientious in their positions, but they are wrong. They are unnecessarily alarmed. They were against the League of Nations, and they are against anything that looks in the direction of international peace.

How long would we wait to establish some international tribunal for peace if we should wait for the Senators who are fighting the World Court, and who fought the League of Nations, to come in here with a proposition? We would not have it.

Implements of war have become so dangerous and deadly, something has to be done to prevent war in the future. I will not go into that phase of the matter now, because I do not intend to delay the Senate long. Some one has made the point that we are going to try to set up a world court over the Supreme Court of the United States. That is not my purpose, and I do not think it is the purpose of anybody who is going to vote for the World Court. There is no such provision in this resolution. The World Court can not exercise jurisdiction over affairs that belong to the domestic concerns of this country. Not a single domestic question can be considered by that court, and no international question where we are interested can be considered by that court, unless this Government, by specific action, authorizes the court to take up the question and consider it. Senators, if that is true, what danger is there in our going in?

I hold to the other proposition, and I do not think anybody will gainsay it, that if the World Court should undertake to take jurisdiction over cases when we did not agree they should take such jurisdiction, against the reservations we put on this proposition, the Congress of the United States could pass an act withdrawing us from the court. Everybody conceded that here yesterday, and whether it is conceded or not, I announce it as a fact. There is no way to keep this country from withdrawing from the court if it wants to do so.

I want to say to those Senators who are such alarmists that the people over there, members of the court, would rather see this country in it than to see any other country in it, because they know we are a big, powerful country and that we are not after conquest; that we love peace, and that we are not a military people. They know that we want to promote peace and not war. So they would be glad to have us in, to have our influence work with that of those who really love peace and want to prevent war in the future. So, Mr. President, there is every argument in favor of us going in and no sound argument against our taking such a course.

I shall conclude with this statement: This country has been confronted with a proposition to do something to promote peace and prevent war since our boys ended the World War in victory. Throughout the Nation various societies and churches have passed resolutions indorsing some plan or other to promote peace in the world and to prevent war. I dare say that in nearly every county in the United States some club, some organization of men, women, and children, and Christian organizations throughout the country have been asking us all along to do something. This is 1926, and the war ended in 1918. Eight years have come and gone, and nothing has been done, and here we are about to get together on something that will unite the forces in this body, setting up a tribunal looking toward preventing war and promoting peace, and we find our same friends who fought the league fighting this, the same ones who fight any proposition of an international character crying out against it and offering nothing.

Suppose this is defeated. Of course, it will not be, but what would we have if it were? Nothing. Who would rejoice if the news should go out from the Capitol that it was defeated? The gun and ammunition makers of the United States and the battleship builders. Talk about propaganda! They are the



gentlemen back of the propaganda. I do not charge that Senators on the other side know about that; they are innocent of so many things. But, Mr. President, who makes money out of war? The gun and ammunition makers make their millions and hundreds of millions. The battleship builders are the first called upon in the event of war. They get busy as soon as the tocsin of war is sounded. They do not want any tribunal to prevent war. But they dare not show their heads in opposition to it. They are away back yonder behind the screen, but they touch the button and the propaganda gets in its work. They know that if they dared come out in the open and oppose it, it would defeat their scheme. They come out here charging that we want to put something over on our country.

Would the President want to tie his country up in a dangerous foreign machine? Would two-thirds of the Members of this body deliberately tie their country up in something that was dangerous and deadly? Would three-fourths of the people of the United States—and they are back of this movement—deliberately petition us to vote for this World Court if they thought it meant ruin to their country?

Mr. President, the proposition is utterly ridiculous. The people want some sort of a peace tribunal set up, and we ought to set one up. This is the only chance we have to help along such a tribunal. Let us put reservations on the resolution if it is not sufficient to guard our interests, and we will stand on our reservations. I dare say that when 25 years shall have passed, if we are still on the stage of action, and I ask these Senators, "What about those dire predictions they made?" they will just say, "Well, we were mistaken." And that will be true. There will be a number of international matters that we would want to submit to an international court. We have long advocated the establishment of such a court. Do we propose to draw ourselves off into a shell and say, "We are not going to have anything to do with the world?" We are an exporting people. We send our produce to the markets of the earth. We want to increase our trade. We want peaceful and cordial relations with other nations.

Mr. President, when our country takes her seat in the World Court, America will be there using her great influence to promote peace throughout the world.

Mr. REED of Missouri obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bayard	Frazier	Lenroot	Robinson, Ind.
Bingham	George	McKellar	Sackett
Bratton	Gillett	McMaster	Schall
Brookhart	Goff	McNary	Sheppard
Bruce	Hale	Mayfield	Shipstead
Butler	Harrell	Means	Simmons
Capper	Harris	Moses	Smith
Caraway	Harrison	Norbeck	Smoot
Copeland	Heflin	Norris	Stanfield
Couzens	Howell	Nye	Stephens
Curtis	Johnson	Oddie	Trammell
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Wadsworth
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Walsh
Fernald	Kendrick	Ransdell	Warren
Ferris	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Fess	King	Reed, Pa.	Williams
Fletcher	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	Wills

Mr. SMITH. I wish to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are engaged at a meeting of the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McKELLAR. My colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TYSON], is necessarily detained from the Senate on business. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. COPELAND. I was requested to announce that the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS] is necessarily detained from the Senate on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the debate has proceeded to considerable length and has taken a wide range. There is scarcely a vagary of the imagination which has not been exploited on the floor of the Senate. Among other questions that have been thrust forward and dwelt upon with tearful insistence are the horrors of war. Those who thus speak blandly assume that is the whole question in the debate and assert that the proposed court or our entrance into it will terminate war and end all human misery. Of course, if that were true, everybody would be for the court. But the question we are to determine is not whether war is horrible, for that everybody knows and we need no insistence to convince

us. Of course, every decent human being would like to see the battle flags furled forever.

But it remains to be determined whether the proposition now before us makes for war or makes for peace; whether, if we should enter the court, we will have more of peace or more of war; whether the United States, by abandoning its ancient policies which kept us at peace with the outside world for more than a century of time, will gain more of peace for herself by remaining aloof from the controversies of Europe and Asia, or whether she will gain more of peace by entering into every controversy of the world and sticking her nose into every dispute of humanity; and likewise whether we will gain more of national dignity, national honor, and national progress by signing a compact or entering into an organization which proposes to permit all of the rest of the world to interfere in American affairs.

So those who have tears may retire and shed them in privacy—tears for war, tears for widows and orphans. That is not the question here, save in the sense that if it can be demonstrated that the United States can safely enter the court without impairment of her dignity and without impairment of her sovereignty and without danger to herself, then the World Court ought to be entered.

If, upon the other hand, however, entrance to the World Court means the entrance of the United States into the disputes of the world and the sending of our young men and our young women to die in foreign lands in the embroilments and battles of foreign countries, then, certainly, we ought to remain out of the court. That is the question.

Moreover, we have been told in the last few minutes that three-fourths of the American people demand our entrance into this court. I assert that nine-tenths of the American people know substantially nothing regarding the proposed court and that nobody has any authority to speak for three-fourths of them or for one-fourth of them or for one-tenth of them. I assert that it is probably true that there are some Senators on this floor who have never read the protocol and statute of the court. I assert that there never has been any public exposition of that statute and of that protocol in such manner as to enable the American people to have a decent opportunity to understand either of them.

To begin with, the problem presented is so intricate as to require a study by the best of lawyers of days and even weeks before the responsibility which we assume can be grasped and understood. I assert that it is fair to say that there have been millions of money expended in working up an apparent sentiment in favor of entering the court, and that probably 999 out of every 1,000 who have signed the petitions in its favor know nothing whatever regarding the real organization, power, and jurisdiction of the court.

When I asked in a resolution the privilege of an investigation so that we could trace this propaganda to its source and develop the financial and other interests back of it, the proponents of the court fled from that investigation and denied it, every single proponent of the court, so far as I know, voting against such an exposition.

We are told that this question has been before the people for a long time. In a technical sense that is true; in a practical sense it is absolutely false. Two or three years ago we began discussing some sort of world court proposal. President Harding sent to the Senate such a proposition. It went to the committee, and it was generally and commonly understood that it had gone into cold storage. It was not discussed on this floor; it was not generally discussed in the country. President Harding, however, proposed at least in one of his speeches, if not in his messages, that a most radical change should be made. What was that change? He said that the court must be entirely divorced from the league, and that in order that it should be divorced from the league the court members then existing should have the right to elect their successors, and those in turn to elect their successors; in other words, he proposed a self-perpetuating judicial oligarchy as undemocratic, as despotic, as infamous as was ever dreamed of in the brain of any man now living or in the brain of any man who is dead.

Following that, President Coolidge indorsed publicly all of the policies of President Harding, specifically stating he was going to carry them out, thus committing himself to this same proposition that the judges of the court then sitting should elect their successors, and those in turn their successors, and so on forever. That was the kind of thing that the people thought was pending here. So far as I was concerned, I was confident that such a proposition would never receive the serious attention of this body or of the American people.

Moreover, we had two elections involving the question of our entrance into the League of Nations. The decision of the people in those two elections was an utter condemnation of the



doctrine of internationalism, for that is the new doctrine with which we are now confronted. So while it is technically true that the so-called World Court proposition has been lying here in the Senate, it is not true that there has been any such discussion carried on for such a length of time as to enlighten the general public of America. I, therefore, say that any attempt to cut off this debate, to shorten the full right of discussion in the Senate, if carried out, will be an attempt at gag rule that will react most disastrously upon its authors and most unfortunately for the country.

Mr. President, who has carried on this propaganda? Every great international banker who was for our entrance into the League of Nations is for it. Every man who has loaned money abroad and would like to have his foreign bonds, which he purchased at an enormous discount, underwritten in the blood and tears of America, is for it. Every foreign influence is for it. Nearly every individual who was for the League of Nations is for it; and the Republicans who were against the League of Nations are now for it because a Republican President is for it. One of the strangest baskets of eggs that ever was carried to market is the one in which the Republican opponents of the League of Nations and Democratic proponents of the League of Nations, including my distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], are all basked together and being carried to market by the hand of Calvin Coolidge. [Laughter.] And one of the strangest sounds ever made in this Chamber, where there have been many strange noises, was that made by the Senator from Alabama when he declared that Calvin Coolidge had said certain things and, therefore, he accepted them as true. [Laughter.]

I have the greatest respect for Mr. Coolidge; but his opinion carries no more weight with me since he happened to be elected President on a national platform which was opposed to internationalism than it carried before he was elected President. There is not a man in this body who would have hesitated an instant to have differed from the opinion of Calvin Coolidge in private life. So his assurance that this adventure is safe carries no more weight with me than his assurance that we ought to take all of the taxes off the great fortunes and leave them on the small fortunes and the poorer people carries weight with me. I want some higher authority.

Mr. President, with these preliminary remarks, I wish to direct the attention of the Senate at some length to the organization which it is proposed we shall enter. I wish, if possible, to get out of the clouds and down to the question before us. I wish to extricate myself from that nebulous belt in which so many of my good friends love to dwell, and which they commonly describe as a sort of millennial period, all of which they promise us is going to come if we will enter this World Court.

Mr. President, one of two propositions is true: This court either has a jurisdiction or it does not have a jurisdiction. A court with jurisdiction may be dangerous, and that danger is to be measured by the degree of its jurisdiction. A court without jurisdiction is of as little use in the economy of life as a bad breath or a white swelling. A court without jurisdiction is a court without power. A court without power is a vacuum; and when men are driven in defense of this proposition to the claim that the court has no power, they are driven to the contention that we propose a cipher and tell us that that cipher represents value.

A court is already set up, and it is said that we will not go into it unless we attach a lot of reservations. If this court is the court of the millenium, if it is going to usher in that day on which my good friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] continually dwells, when the lion and the lamb shall lie down together and a little child shall lead them—and he wants us all to follow the little child, so why not resign your seat and send here some little girl about 8 years old to do the legislating?—if this court will produce such results as are predicted by these overenthusiastic advocates, then why not join it without reservations? Why put hobbles on the millennium? Why stay the march of progress? Why do you not join the grand procession? Why do you not unite your hosannas with those of the multitude? Why do you not proceed with it to this holy of holies, where all is good and sweet communion of the saints is enjoyed? Why do you say, "Here is the sanctuary where virtue dwells and goodness makes its home, but I am not going in through the door. I am going to crawl halfway over the transom. I am going to be half in and half out. I do not want to be entirely sanctified. I just want to get my head inside the transom, so that I can back out of this sacred place as soon as it gets dangerous?"

Why, Senators, when you propose to make reservations to this court protocol and statute you certify your heart's belief that there is danger lurking there. When you say you will submit to no jurisdiction unless you consent in that particular case,

you certify that you fear the decisions of the court. When you say that you will reserve the right to stay out on every question that you do not want to submit, you certify that the court is a doubtful court and that it might exercise its jurisdiction in such manner as to imperil the rights and liberties of your country. So you fear it while you enter it. So you say to all the world: "We discredit this court in advance; we doubt it; we fear it"; and any denial of that statement is not an honest denial.

Let us see what is in this Pandora's box. Let us take the time to analyze it. Let us understand whether it is something or nothing. Let us understand whether it is to have a jurisdiction or no jurisdiction.

Let us understand one thing further: We can not treat these questions from the standpoint that this tribunal which is to be set up is to be a court of justice, for a court that has jurisdiction to do justice also has jurisdiction to do injustice. The power to decide a question at all is the power to decide it either right or wrong. So there is no guaranty that this court will act in favor of world peace. There is no guaranty, and can be none, that its decisions may not ultimately be written in blood. There is no guaranty that its jurisdiction may not be so exercised as to forge chains for a world and destroy the aspirations of all men who seek to enlarge their liberties.

Somebody—some Senator, I think, but he did not send me his name—sent over a note, and it contains these questions:

Could we have had our independence from England if the league had existed, and the question had been submitted to a world court like the one you were speaking of?

Could we have been free to have annexed Texas and brought that vast and splendid domain within the jurisdiction of a free Nation had this court, or one like it, existed?

May Canada now assert her desire for liberty and become free, and hope to do so with the existence of the league and under the decision of this court?

Could we have emancipated Cuba had we been within the jurisdiction of the court, and compelled to submit to the decision of the court?

And to these questions which I now ask there could be added a large number of other questions of similar import.

Mr. President, I say again, let us look into the structure of this court.

There is no such thing as a world court. There is an organization which may be identified by the name "The league court." It was provided for in the league compact. It was created by the league pursuant to that compact. Its members are selected by the league or the league members. The rules and regulations governing the court emanate from the league. It can be abolished by the league. Its membership can be changed by the league. It is a foreign tribunal, pure and simple, created, dominated, and controlled solely by foreign nations.

The United States is not a member of the league, and had no voice in the creation of the court. The United States has no voice in the selection of any of the successors of the so-called judges of the court. The United States had no part in enacting the rules or regulations of the court. There is no law governing the court except the will of its members and the mandates of the League of Nations.

The proposition, therefore, is that the United States shall agree to submit its controversies with foreign nations to a tribunal created by foreign nations and composed of the delegates of foreign nations, and in which the United States has no adequate assurance either of membership or of voice. That is internationalism, and it is a miserable kind of internationalism.

One hundred and fifty years ago the Revolutionists fought to establish the complete independence and sovereignty of these United States. They declared they would brook no interference by any power on earth; that the sovereign citizens of the United States should alone enact the laws and control the policies of this Republic. They declared for an absolute divorce from the monarchies of Europe. They obtained that divorce at Yorktown, when the British Empire was compelled to lower its flag. A little later they declared the dominance of the Republic upon the Western Hemisphere, and warned foreign nations against further aggression on this side of the sea; and at the same time James Monroe declared that the United States would not tolerate interference by European powers in this hemisphere. He further declared that we would not seek to obtrude ourselves into European controversies, and when we do obtrude ourselves into European controversies we repeal or nullify the first article of the Monroe doctrine.

For a century and a half the American Republic has acknowledged two slogans:

Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain.



Millions for defense, and not a penny for tribute.

Accordingly, we have hitherto steadfastly clung to the doctrines that the sons and daughters of America would for themselves determine the policies of the Nation, and that foreign influence and foreign dictation should be rejected as intolerable.

From whence emanates the sinister argument that we should substitute for these heroic doctrines a policy looking to a pusillanimous surrender of the rights of the American Nation to the judgment or rights of foreign powers? Who are these who would place above the American flag the bastard banner of internationalism? Who preaches this doctrine? From what poisoned fountain does it emanate? What selfish interests are to be served? What forces are these which propose to rush us into the league court without time for consideration by the American people, as a gold-brick man seeks to rush a prospective victim into a hasty and disastrous bargain? How many people of the United States know what the league court is? When has it been analyzed generally before the American people?

Who are the men to whom the propagandists and hired agents of somebody would have us submit the interests of America? Who are the members of this court to whom you rush with the fate of America in your hands?

Max Huber, president, of Switzerland.

Rafael Altamira y Crevea, of Spain.

Charles Andre Weiss, of France.

Dionisio Anzilotti, of Italy.

Antonio Sanchez de Bustamante, of Cuba.

Robert Bannatyne, Viscount Finlay, of Great Britain.

Bernard Cornelius J. Loder, of the Netherlands.

John Bassett Moore, a citizen of the United States, serving in a foreign country for a foreign salary.

Didrik Galtrup Gjedde Nyholm, of Denmark.

Yerozu Oda, of Japan.

Epitacio da Silva Pessoa, of Brazil.

Who are the deputy judges?

Frederick Valdemar Nikolai Beichmann, of Norway.

Mikhailo Jovanovitch, of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State.

Dumitriu Negulescu, of Rumania.

Wang Chung Hui, of China.

[Laughter.]

To these men you propose to submit questions in which America is concerned. A few days ago I read this list of names, and at once offense was taken. It was said I was appealing to a low sentiment when I was asking for consideration of the names. Then it was asserted that there were a large number of men with foreign names, or with peculiar names, in our country, and that some of them had served in the war. I do not call this list of names to create laughter because of their strangeness to our ears.

I call them to emphasize the fact that they are a body of foreign gentlemen representing foreign nations, many of them representing nations utterly different from ourselves, representing codes of law utterly different from our codes of law, representing systems of religion entirely different from our systems of religion. If my friend the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], whom I love and admire, were to quote the Scripture to this body over there, as he quotes it to us so frequently, only about three of those judges could understand his eloquent Alabama language, and none of them would know what he was talking about. It is a foreign court, named by the representatives of foreign nations, foreign in tongue, foreign in religion, foreign in basic thought, foreign in the principles of civilization, foreign in every way. Yet to this court we propose to consign the destinies of America, or we propose nothing.

It may be answered, of course, that John Bassett Moore is a citizen of the United States. How did he get on the court? He was selected by some foreign country to act as a decoy duck for the United States. The duck is not a very intelligent bird, but not one of them could ever be induced to alight in a pond with so transparent a decoy. John Bassett Moore may be there to-morrow and may be there the day after, but whether he is there or whether he is not there, I do not want John Bassett Moore or any other man to decide questions that concern America vitally. No body but an American tribunal created by the American people should decide such questions.

How would you gentlemen like to be sitting shivering in your chairs six months from now awaiting the decision of the World Court on some question involving the great interests of America, and speculating on how Yerozu Oda is going to vote on that question? How would you feel if you thought your fate depended upon the gentleman who bears the eupho-

nious name of Dionisio Anzilotti, or Didrik Galtrup Gjedde Nyholm, of Denmark, or Antonio Sanchez de Bustamante, of Cuba? Or, dropping down to the deputy judges who might be summoned, how would you like to have a question involving the Monroe doctrine settled by Mikhailo Javanovid or Dumitriu Negulescu or Wang Chung Hui?

Of course, I do not pronounce these names correctly, but if you enter the World Court you will have to learn how to pronounce them, and you will have to wait in breathless suspense the votes of these gentlemen when your country's fate is involved.

I cast no imputations upon these men. I do not care how exalted they may be in their respective countries; and I respect the countries of the earth. I do not care how earnest they may be in the laws of their lands. They are not bone of our bone; they are not flesh of our flesh; they are not wedded to our systems of law. They do not think as we think in many cases. They live under entirely different forms of government, and, as I shall show later on, those governments have interests absolutely opposed to the interests of the United States, and these judges will respond to the interests of their countries.

It is true that one of them, the gentleman from Japan, suggested that that would not be true, because, he said, the judges might be deified, and he said that in one of the solemn conventions of jurists who devised the statutes of the league court. If anybody disputes that I can produce the official record. He suggested that the judges could always be put in a position to be just by being deified, a doctrine not foreign at all to the philosophy of Japan, where they deify their ancestors and worship the ghosts of their departed.

It is to this body you propose to consign the fate of the United States, or you are playing battledore and shuttlecock with words and setting up a shadow and telling us that shadow will produce peace in the world and stop all wars, and yet you are saying that it does not possess power.

Mr. President, there were some internationalists in this country during the war. There were some internationalists in other countries. There is an international movement on. There are societies that were organized in Europe many years ago by Andrew Carnegie, whose estate's money is being expended to-day for propaganda for the very ideas he taught. There were people during the war who said that they believed in international peace and that they would not support this Government in the contest. We sent most of them to the penitentiary. There are people to-day who condemn the Bolsheviks for, as they claim, teaching Bolshevism to the world, teaching it in the form that there should be no national adherence and no national life, but that we should all be some sort of a general conglomerate.

I can not draw the line in principle between the doctrine of the Bolshevik or the proletariat who teaches that kind of internationalism, and the doctrine and philosophy taught by Andrew Carnegie, taught by his money, and taught by some men very close to this Chamber that we must sink our nationality into the vortex of the world and that we shall sacrifice American interests in the interests of the world at large.

For my part, when the world is on one side and America on the other, I shall think only of my country, for I shall know that when the light of America goes out the darkness of tyranny will return to the earth, and that there is no greater jeopardy to human freedom and no greater blow that can be struck to mankind in general than to impair the majesty and power of the leadership of this Nation.

Mr. President, I have made some reference to Mr. Carnegie. I hesitate to speak of a man who is dead. I speak of it now because he is largely the author of this movement. I speak of it because his money is now being expended in carrying on the propaganda. Therefore, that which he said when living and which is perpetuated by his dead hands, which lies largely at the basis of this doctrine of internationalism that is now being taught, is pertinent to the question, and I want to lay that article before the Senate.

In the article Mr. Carnegie laments the fact that we have rebelled against Great Britain. In the article he argues there was not sufficient cause. In the article he demands that the United States shall return to the mother country. Following that article he organized these societies all over the world and helped to finance them, and some of them are functioning to-day.

I send to the desk and ask to have read as a part of my remarks the article of Andrew Carnegie printed in the North American Review in 1893. True to his faith he returned to his native soil to die.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Clerk will read as requested.



The Chief Clerk read as follows:

A LOOK AHEAD

(This article is the closing chapter of the new edition of *Triumphant Democracy*, embracing the results of the 1890 census, which is soon to be issued by Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons.)

(By Andrew Carnegie)

I think one excusable who has been compelled to live for months among figures and hard facts and record only the past if, his task accomplished, he indulges in a look ahead, where not what is but what is to be is considered, and where, being no longer bound by results achieved, he is fancy free.

I have taken this privilege freely for myself in this closing chapter, and, Utopian as the dream may seem, I place on record my belief that it is one day to become a reality.

Until a little more than a hundred years ago the English-speaking race dwelt together in unity, the American being as much a citizen of Britain as the Scotsman, Welshman, or Irishman. A difference unhappily arose under the British Constitution, their common heritage, as to the right of the citizens of the older part of the state to tax their fellows in the newer part across the sea without their consent; but separation was not contemplated by Washington, Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Jay, and other leaders. On the contrary, these great men never ceased to proclaim their loyalty to and their desire to remain part of Britain, and they disclaimed any idea of separation, which was, indeed, accepted at last, but only when forced upon them as a sad necessity from which there was no honorable escape if they were to maintain the rights they had acquired not as American but as British citizens.

On the other hand, the motherland, which forced the issue upon her loyal citizens in America, sees nothing more clearly to-day than that she was in error, and that she converted a constitutional agitation for redress of grievances into a question of patriotic resistance to the exercise of unconstitutional power, an issue which Britons have never been slow to accept and have never failed successfully to meet. There is no British statesman who does not feel that if the Britons in America had not resisted taxation without representation and fought out the issue to the end they would have been false to the blood in their veins.

I desire to give my readers in the old land and in the new some idea of the position of the two parties after the difference between them arose.

The following quotations from the credentials presented by the delegates from several of the American Provinces to the First Continental Congress, organized September 5, 1774, show the spirit which then prevailed.

Delegates from the Province of New Hampshire were instructed—  
"To secure and to perpetuate their [the Colonies'] rights, liberties, and privileges and to restore that peace, harmony, and mutual confidence which once happily subsisted between the parent country and her Colonies."

Those of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, Samuel and John Adams among them, were charged to seek—

"The restoration of union and harmony between Great Britain and the Colonies, most ardently desired by all good men."

The great Province of Pennsylvania sent delegates for conference—  
"And for establishing that union and harmony between Great Britain and the Colonies which is indispensably necessary to the welfare and happiness of both."

Virginia wished its delegates, among whom were Washington, Randolph, and Lee—

"To secure British America from the ravage and ruin of arbitrary taxes and speedily to procure the return of that harmony and union so beneficial to the whole empire and so ardently desired by all British America."

We quote now from addresses and petitions adopted by the Continental Congress.

From an address to the people of Great Britain, approved October 21, 1774, and written, according to Jefferson, by John Jay:

"We believe there is yet much virtue, much justice, much public spirit in the English nation. To that justice we now appeal. You have been told that we are seditious, impatient of government, and desirous of independency. Be assured that these are not facts but calumnies. Permit us to be as free as yourselves, and we shall ever esteem a union with you to be our greatest glory and our greatest happiness."

From the petition of the Congress to the King:

"We ask but for peace, liberty, and safety. We wish not a diminution of the prerogative, nor do we solicit the grant of any new right in our favor. Your royal authority over us, and our connection with Great Britain, we shall always carefully and zealously endeavor to support and maintain."

On Monday, June 12, 1775, the Second Continental Congress passed a resolution for a fast, the Battles of Lexington and Concord having just taken place, seeking aid—

"To avert those desolating judgments with which we are threatened, and to bless our rightful sovereign, King George III."

From the declaration of Congress, setting forth the causes and necessity of taking up arms, adopted July 6, 1775, a few weeks after the Battle of Bunker Hill:

"Lest this declaration should disquiet the minds of our friends and fellow subjects in any part of the Empire, we assure them that we mean not to dissolve that union which has so long and so happily subsisted between us and which we sincerely wish to see restored. We have not raised armies with ambitious designs of separating from Great Britain and establishing independent states. We fight not for glory or for conquest."

From the petition to the King dated July 8, 1775, signed by the Members of the Congress present:

"Attached to Your Majesty's person, family, and government with all the devotion that principle and affection can inspire, connected with Great Britain by the strongest ties that can unite societies, and deploring every event that tends in any degree to weaken them, we solemnly assure Your Majesty that we not only most ardently desire the former harmony between her and these colonies may be restored, but that a concord may be established between them upon so firm a basis as to perpetuate its blessings, uninterrupted by any future dissensions, to succeeding generations in both countries."

From an address to the inhabitants of Great Britain, also adopted by the Congress July 8:

"We are accused of aiming at independence; but how is this accusation supported? By the allegations of your ministers, not by our actions. \* \* \* Yet give us leave most solemnly to assure you that we have not yet lost sight of the object we have ever had in view, a reconciliation with you on constitutional principles, and a restoration of that friendly intercourse, which, to the advantage of both, we till lately maintained."

Thomas Jefferson wrote:

"\* \* \* I am sincerely one of those and would rather be in dependence on Great Britain, properly limited, than on any nation on earth, or than on no nation."

"Believe me, dear sir, there is not in the British Empire a man who more cordially loves a union with Great Britain than I do."

Benjamin Franklin testified before the committee of the House of Commons:

"They [the colonists] consider themselves as a part of the British Empire, and as having one common interest with it; they may be looked on here as foreigners, but they do not consider themselves as such. They are zealous for the honor and prosperity of this nation; and, while they are well used, will always be ready to support it as far as their little power goes."—From the *Life of Franklin*, by John Bigelow. Lippincott. Vol. I, page 495.

On July 13, 1774, Jay was appointed a member of a committee of New York citizens to draw up resolutions on the nonimportation policy. This committee reported:

"That it is our greatest happiness and glory to have been born British subjects, and that we wish nothing more ardently than to live and die as such;" that "the act for blocking up the port of Boston is \* \* \* subversive of every idea of British liberty;" and that it should be left to the proposed Congress to determine the question of nonimportation, which would be justified only by "dire necessity."—John Jay, by George Pellew, pages 31 and 32.

While the British-Americans were thus proclaiming their love, affection, and loyalty for the parent land, and pleading for British rights and the union, we turn to those in Britain who are now regarded as the greatest and wisest statesmen of that time. Hear the words of Pitt:

"It is my opinion that this kingdom has no right to lay a tax upon the Colonies. At the same time I assert the authority of this Kingdom over the Colonies to be sovereign and supreme, in every circumstance of government and legislation whatsoever. They are the subjects of this Kingdom equally entitled with yourselves to all the natural rights of mankind, and the peculiar privileges of Englishmen; equally bound by its laws and equally participating in the constitution of this free country. The Americans are the sons, not the bastards of England. Taxation is no part of the governing or legislative power. The taxes are a voluntary gift and grant of the commons alone. \* \* \* When, therefore, in this house we give and grant, we give and grant what is our own. But in an American tax, what do we do? We, Your Majesty's commons for Great Britain, give and grant to Your Majesty, what? Our own property? No. We give and grant to Your Majesty the property of Your Majesty's commons in America. It is an absurdity in terms."—From a speech by William Pitt, afterwards Lord Chatham, in the House of Commons, January 16, 1776.

Let us hear Burke:

"No man ever doubted that the commodity of tea could bear an imposition of 3 pence. But no commodity will bear 3 pence, or will bear a penny, when the general feelings of men are irritated, and 2,000,000 of people are resolved not to pay. The feelings of the Colonies were formerly the feelings of Great Britain. Theirs were formerly the feelings of Mr. Hampden when called upon for the pay-

ment of 20 shillings. Would 20 shillings have ruined Mr. Hampden's fortune? No; but the payment of half 20 shillings, on the principle it was demanded, would have made him a slave."

"Again and again revert to your own principles—seek peace and ensue it—leave America, if she has taxable matter in her, to tax herself. I am not here going into the distinctions of rights, not attempting to mark their boundaries. I do not enter into these metaphysical distinctions; I hate the very sound of them. Leave the Americans as they anciently stood, and these distinctions, born of our unhappy contest, will die along with it. They and we, and they and our ancestors, have been happy under that system. Let the memory of all actions in contradiction to that good old mode, on both sides, be extinguished forever. Be content to bind America by laws of trade; you have always done it. Let this be your reason for binding their trade. Do not burden them by taxes; you were not used to do so from the beginning. Let this be your reason for not taxing. These are the arguments of states and kingdoms. Leave the rest to the schools, for there only they may be discussed with safety."—From a speech on American taxation, delivered in the House of Commons April 19, 1774.

Horace Walpole said:

"You will not be surprised that I am what I always was, a zealot for liberty in every part of the globe, and consequently that I most heartily wish success to the Americans. They have hitherto not made one blunder; and the administration have made a thousand, besides the two capital ones of first provoking and then of uniting the Colonies. The latter seem to have as good heads and hearts as we want both." From a letter to Horace Mann, dated September 7, 1775. Horace Walpole and His World, Scribner's, page 152.

In a letter dated February 17, 1779, Horace Walpole says:

"Liberty has still a continent (America) to exist in. I do not care a straw who is minister in this abandoned country. It is the good old cause of freedom that I have at heart."

Isaac Barré, member of Parliament, 1761 to 1790, said, in reply to Lord North's declaration that he would never think of repealing the tea duty until he saw America prostrate at his feet:

"To effect this is not so easy as some imagine; the Americans are a numerous, a respectable, a hardy, a free people. But were it ever so easy, does any friend to his country really wish to see America thus humbled? In such a situation she would serve only as a monument of your arrogance and your folly. For my part, the America I wish to see is America increasing and prosperous, raising her head in graceful dignity, with freedom and firmness asserting her rights at your bar, vindicating her liberties, pleading her services, and conscious of her merit. This is the America that will have spirit to fight your battles, to sustain you when hard pushed by some prevailing foe, and by her industry will be able to consume your manufactures, support your trade, and pour wealth and splendor into your towns and cities. If we do not change our conduct toward her, America will be torn from our side. \* \* \* Unless you repeal this law, you run the risk of losing America."

David Hartley, member of Parliament for Kingston-upon-Hull, in a speech in the house, May 15, 1777, concluded with these prophetic words:

"\* \* \* I will venture to prophesy that the principles of a federal alliance are the only terms of peace that ever will and that ever ought to obtain between the two countries."

On November 2, 1775, Mr. Hartley concluded another speech with these words:

"Let the only contention henceforward between Great Britain and America be, which shall exceed the other in zeal for establishing the fundamental rights of liberty for all mankind."

Jonathan Shipley, Bishop of St. Asaph, in 1774, made a speech intended to have been spoken on the bill for altering the charters of the Colonies of Massachusetts Bay:

"Let them continue to enjoy the liberty our fathers gave them. Gave them, did I say? They are coheirs of liberty with ourselves; and their portion of the inheritance has been much better looked after than ours. My Lords, I look upon North America as the only great nursery of freemen now left upon the face of the earth. But whatever may be our future fate, the greatest glory that attends this country, a greater than any other nation ever acquired, is to have formed and nursed up to such a state of happiness those Colonies whom we are now so eager to butcher."

Both Briton and American being now fully agreed that those who made the attempt to tax without giving the right of representation were wrong, and that in resisting this the colonists vindicated their rights as British citizens and therefore only did their duty, the question arises, Is a separation thus forced upon one of the parties, and now thus deeply regretted by the other, to be permanent?

I can not think so, and I crave permission to adduce some considerations in support of my belief that the future is certainly to see a reunion of the separated parts and once again a common citizenship.

First. In race—and there is a great deal in race—the American remains three-fourths purely British. The mixture of the German, which constitutes substantially all of the remainder, though not strictly British, is yet Germanic. The Briton of to-day is himself composed in large measure of the Germanic element, and German, Briton, and American are all of the Teutonic race.

The amount of blood other than Anglo-Saxon and Germanic which has entered into the American is almost too trifling to deserve notice, and has been absorbed without changing him in any fundamental trait. The American remains British, differing less from the Briton than the Irishman, Scotsman, Welshman, and Englishman differ from each other. Englishmen, Scotsmen, Welshmen, and Irishmen are all Britons, and the American (a term which of course includes the Canadian) entering among these would be as near the common type resulting from a union of the five as any of the other parts. Indeed, the American in many respects resembles the Scotsman more than the Englishman does, and he also in other respects resembles the Englishman more than does the Scot. He resembles both Englishman and Scot much more than the Irishman resembles either. His introduction into a common British-American citizenship would not produce a resultant differing greatly from that of the present union of Scot, Welshman, Irishman, and Englishman. The action of a Congress elected by all these elements would not differ much upon fundamental questions affecting the rights, liberties, and privileges of the people from a Congress of Americans sitting in Washington, or of Canadians in Ottawa, or from the action of a British Parliament similarly elected sitting in London. No citizen of any of the present States, either British or American, would have reason to fear the loss of anything which he now holds dear. He could rest securely in the belief that his fellows of the other States could be trusted so to act that the united mass would not oscillate.

A feeling of confidence in each other among the respective communities of the race in Great Britain and America may be expected to grow as political institutions continue to assimilate.

It is to be noted that only in the region of political ideas is there dissimilarity, for no rupture whatever between the parts has ever taken place in language, literature, religion, or law. In these uniformity has always existed; although separated politically the unity of the parts has never been disturbed in these strong, cohesive, and cementing links. The books and periodicals read upon both sides of the Atlantic are rapidly becoming the same. The decision of one court is good law in all. Language remains uniform, every approved change in one part of the great realm rapidly being adopted throughout the English-speaking world. Religious ideas are the common property of the race. There seems nothing, therefore, to keep the sections of the race apart, but everything to reunite them.

Second. No one questions that if, instead of 1,800 miles of water between America and Britain, there lay another Mississippi Valley, the English-speaking race would be one politically, since the federal system of government has proved that immense areas can be successfully governed under one head, and can exist as one power, the freest government of the parts producing the strongest government of the whole. The difference of land and water lying between people has hitherto been great, and, in the words of the poet, instead of mountains, we can say that—

"Oceans interposed

Make enemies of nations, who had else,  
Like kindred drops, been mingled into one."

This is quite true of the past; but oceans no longer constitute barriers between nations. These already furnish the cheapest of all modes of communication between men. It has been my good fortune recently to travel from the Pacific coast to Britain. The journey from San Francisco to New York was made in a moving hotel, in which our party traveled for six weeks and had every want supplied. The time necessary for the trip is five days. The other half of the journey, after a short rest at the halfway house, New York, was performed in one of the best ocean greyhounds, the time consumed from land to land being only a few hours more than that required for the journey from San Francisco to New York. Over land and over sea we had traveled under the best conditions of to-day. No luxury was wanting. The moving hotel over the land was the best of its kind, as was the moving hotel over the water. The ocean voyage was by far the less fatiguing and in every respect more comfortable than the overland journey.

The future is, probably, to render travel by sea, if not quite as fast, yet more comfortable to people in general than land travel can possibly be made. The delegate to a conference at Washington, leaving Liverpool or Southampton, now reaches that city in just about the same time as the delegate from San Francisco, Seattle, or Victoria, on the Pacific coast. At the time England and Scotland were united members of Parliament from the north of Scotland required as long to reach London. A short time ago many of the American Representatives to Congress consumed more time in reaching Washington than either of these. The time required is being lessened every year. The next three months are to see both the ocean and the land journey materially reduced.



Third. The telegraph connecting London, Edinburgh, Dublin, Cardiff, New Orleans, San Francisco, New York, Washington, Montreal, Quebec, and Ottawa, bringing all into instantaneous communication, is the most important factor in rendering political reunion possible, and I venture to say inevitable. Without this agency it might well be doubted whether one central authority could act for all the scattered parts, but when events and problems as they arise, and the discussions upon them at the center, can be instantly known at the extremities, and become everywhere the subject of contemporaneous debate and consideration, thus permitting the center to influence the extremities and the extremities to respond to the center, the pulse beat of the entire Nation can be constantly felt by the Government and all the people. No matter where the capital may be, it must still be omnipresent and in touch with all parts of the confederacy. Time is therefore no longer to be taken into account at all, and distance means but little when all can instantly hear everything that transpires.

Fourth. The advantages of a race confederation are so numerous and so obvious that one scarcely knows how to begin their enumeration. Consider its defensive power. A reunion of the Anglo-Americans, consisting to-day of 108,000,000, which 50 years hence will number more than 200,000,000, would be unassailable upon land by any power or combination of powers that it is possible to create. We need not, therefore, take into account attacks upon the land; as for the water, the combined fleets would sweep the seas. The new nation would dominate the world and banish from the earth its greatest stain—the murder of men by men. It would be the arbiter between nations and enforce the peaceful settlement of all quarrels, saying to any disputants who threatened to draw the sword:

"Hold! I command you both;  
The one that stirs makes me his foe.  
Unfold to me the cause of quarrel,  
And I will judge betwixt you."

Such a giant among pigmies as the Re-United States would never need to exert its power, but only to intimate its wishes and decisions. It would be unnecessary for any power to maintain either a great standing army or a great navy. The smaller nations, having discovered that they would not be permitted to disturb the peace of the world, would naturally disarm. There would be no use in maintaining large forces either for attack or defense when the Anglo-American had determined that no one should attack. I believe that the wisdom of the reunited nation and its regard for others would be so great as to give it such moral ascendancy that there would be no disposition upon the part of any power to appeal from its decisions. All would acquire the habit of settling disputes by an appeal to this supreme tribunal, the friend of all, the enemy of none, without thought of ever going beyond its decrees.

Fifth. There are higher, though perhaps not more powerful, considerations than the material benefits involved in reunion. Regarding these I should like Britons to consider what the proposed reunion means. Not the most sanguine advocate of "imperial federation" dares to intimate that the federation he dreams of would free the markets of all its members to each other. This question can not even be discussed when the imperial conferences meet. If it be introduced, it is judiciously shelved. But an Anglo-American reunion brings free entry here of all British products as a matter of course. The richest market in the world is opened to Britain free of all duty by a stroke of the pen. No tax can be laid upon products of any part of the union, even for revenue, although under "free trade" such taxes might still exist. What would not trade with the Republic "duty free" mean to the linen, woolen, iron, and steel industries of Scotland, to the tin-plate manufacturers of Wales, to the woolen and cotton, coal, iron, cutlery, and steel industries of England? It would mean prosperity to every industry in the United Kingdom, and this in turn would mean renewed prosperity to the agricultural interest, now so sorely depressed.

Few except those engaged in manufacturing realize the position of Britain as a manufacturer in regard to the American market. The ocean, which many are still apt to consider a barrier between the two countries, is the very agency which brings them so close and will ultimately bind them together. Coal, iron, steel, and all kinds of merchandise from Britain reach American ports more cheaply than American manufactures produced within a hundred miles of these ports. Thus the coal, iron, and steel from Glasgow, Hull, Newcastle, or Liverpool reach the cities of New Orleans, Charleston, Savannah, Richmond, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Portland more cheaply than the same articles mined or manufactured in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Tennessee, or Alabama, the land carriage from these States being far greater than the ocean carriage from Great Britain. To the whole Pacific coast Britain is so much nearer in cost as to give her under reunion the complete command of that market. In the event of reunion, the American manufacturers would supply the interior of the country, but the great populations skirting the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific coast would receive their manufactured articles chiefly from Britain. The heavy products are taken from Britain to the United

States in many instances as ballast for nothing. The freight charge is generally trifling. I do not hesitate to say that reunion would bring with it such demand for British products as would tax the present capacity of Britain to the utmost, for the products of continental nations, which now compete so seriously with Britain, would be almost excluded, even by a tariff strictly for revenue. There would not be an idle mine, furnace, or factory in the land. The consumption of coal in the United States is already greater than in Britain; of iron and steel it is now fully double. Our consumption of tin plate exceeds that of all the rest of the world. The imports of British textile fabrics grow year after year. These never were so great as at present. The only nation which is taking more and more of British products is the Republic. The American market is enormous and constantly expanding. It is in vain that people in Britain hope for any radical change in the tariff laws. No party in the United States can or will make many material changes in these. Revenue will continue to be raised by duties upon imports as at present and chiefly upon the fine textile fabrics—the luxuries of the rich. There can be little question that nothing would so certainly insure the permanent prosperity of Britain as free access to the American market, which can be effected so easily through reunion, which would also bring with it enhanced value to land as the result of prosperity in all branches of British trade and industry; and were Britain and America again one, the American would find the former the best summer home within his reach. Many would purchase such homes there and secure for themselves the delights of a beneficial change of climate and contact with a thousand sources of sweet influences only to be gained in the old home of the race. The prophecy of the Spectator, made many years ago and just repeated, would be fully realized, that the British-American would find the old home his "restful park." It is not going too far to say that every kind of property in the sceptered isle and every business interest would be permanently doubled in value by reunion.

I do not shut my eyes to the fact that reunion, bringing free entrance of British products, would cause serious disturbance to many manufacturing interests near the Atlantic coast, which have been built up under the protective system. But, sensitive as the American is said to be to the influence of the dollar, there is a chord in his nature—the patriotic—which is much more sensitive still. Judging from my knowledge of the American manufacturers, there are few who would not gladly make the necessary pecuniary sacrifices to bring about a reunion of the old home and the new. There would be some opposition, of course, from those peculiarly interested, but this would be silenced by the chorus of approval from the people in general. No private interests or interests of a class or of a section of what would then be our common country would or should be allowed to obstruct a consummation so devoutly to be wished.

If the question be judged in Britain by the material benefits certain to flow from it, never in all her history was such enormous material gain within her reach, and never as much as now has the future position of Britain so urgently required just such an assurance of continued prosperity. The development of manufactures in other lands seriously menaces her future. She has already lost much in cotton manufacture, which I fear is never to be regained. The product of iron has fallen from nearly nine to less than seven millions of tons. We see decreases written too often in her trade statistics which might be charged to the ebb and flow of industrial affairs were they not accompanied by startling increases in like branches in competing nations.

Her position is the most artificial of all nations, islands that can not grow half enough of food to feed her people, but which produce double the amount of manufactured articles they can consume. Such a nation in order to be secure of her future must have a market for these surplus articles and more land from which to draw food for her people. This is precisely what reunion offers—the most valuable and the most rapidly increasing market in the world for her manufactures, and the richest soil for the production of the food she requires. Reunion restores her to ownership in hundreds of millions of acres of fresh, fertile soil, the like of which is elsewhere unknown, reopens a market for her manufactures sufficient even to-day to absorb all her surplus.

Reunion will further benefit the United Kingdom in regard to debt and taxation, potent factors in the industrial race of nations. The national debt per capita of the United States, amounts to \$14, that of Britain to \$88, that of Canada to \$48. The percentage of taxation in the United States, national, State, and local, to earnings was 5.04 last decade; in the United Kingdom, 9.03—nearly double. When the union is restored it will be upon the basis of uniting also the national debts as they stand, and making all a common obligation of the union, so that the United Kingdom would be relieved at once of the greater portion of its national debt, and of at least one-half of all its present heavy taxation, even if no reduction of expenditure resulted from having one general government, one army and navy instead of two. About one-fourth of all national taxation in recent years in the Republic has gone in payment of debt, and a much greater proportion recently for pensions, which are temporary, so that the current expenses of the general government will after a time not require more than one-half the present amount of taxation.



The only course for Britain seems to be reunion with her giant child, or sure decline to a secondary place, and then to comparative insignificance in the future annals of the English-speaking race, which is to increase so rapidly in America. Heaven forbid that she who has been and yet is so great, and still so deeply revered, should unwisely choose continued separation and tread a by-path apart leading to an inglorious career. Let her statesmen study the situation, therefore, and learn that reunion with her American children is the only sure way to prevent continued decline. Reunited with these, Britain takes a new lease of prosperity; decline is arrested and increase begins.

Sixth. The influence upon the individual citizen of power in the state and especially of power used for great and good ends is immeasurable. The conquering Briton has conquered more and more easily as he has had behind him more and more of a record of achievements of his race. "I am a Roman citizen" was a boast which made him who uttered it not only a greater Roman but a greater man. To develop heroes there must be occasions for heroism. To develop statesmen the state must have a great part to play in the world. Had the Republic remained a mere colony it would never have discovered its Franklin, Adams, Hamilton, and Hancock, and what would the world have known of Washington? What part could he have ever played to make him Washington? What would the world have known of that genius Lincoln, the greatest statesman of the century, or of many centuries, had he not been called upon to preserve the Republic, and with a stroke of the pen to make 4,000,000 slaves freemen? In like manner Hampden, Pym, Elliott and Cromwell would have remained comparatively obscure men but for the part which it was possible for them to play upon so large a stage as Britain. What the British boy grows to be as a citizen largely depends upon how he is fashioned by knowing and dwelling upon the history of his country's triumphs and of its leaders in the past. What would the American boy become as a citizen if he had not his Washington and other Revolutionary heroes to inspire him, and cause the blood to tingle in his veins as he reads the story of his country's struggle for independence? What kind of a man would the Scotsman be if bereft of the glorious history of his country and its sacrifices for the cause of civil and religious liberty? He is fed upon and becomes part of Wallace, Knox, and Burns. Every state should aim to be great and powerful, and noble in the exercise of its power, because power in the state, nobly exercised, is the strongest influence in producing good and patriotic citizens. Every citizen, being a constituent part of the state under democracy, partakes in some measure of its greatness. A small and petty political unity tends to breed small and petty men of all classes; dealing with great affairs broadens and elevates the character. All these and many other considerations plead for reunion.

Let us now consider the position and feelings of the various parts of the English-speaking world toward reunion, beginning with Canada. Canada would undoubtedly favor reunion. She would gladly reenter a race federation of which Britain and the United States were again the other members. Therefore it can be said of her: "She is ready."

Touching the United States, we find the American Union constantly adding States. The original 13 have now swollen to 44. Other States, now in process of formation, will soon raise the number to 50. So quietly are these admissions made that the Nation is scarcely aware of them. A convention of the people of a Territory decides to ask admission to the Union as a State; Congress passes a bill of a few lines, which the President signs, admitting the new member. Elections are held in the new State for governor, members of a State legislature, and officers of the State, and also for Representatives and Senators. The latter make their appearance in Washington, present their credentials, take the oath and their seat in the national councils. There is nothing more to be done. The State attends to all its internal affairs, and the General Government attends to all general matters. The American people are favorable to the extension of national boundaries. No evil, but great good, has come from every succeeding addition to their union. Therefore a proposition to reunite Britain and the Republic would not seem anything novel to them. They are used to territorial extension.

The reunion idea would be hailed with enthusiasm. No idea yet promulgated since the formation of union would create such unalloyed satisfaction. It would sweep the country. No party would oppose, each would try to excel the other in approval. Therefore as of Canada so of the Republic we can say: "She is ready."

Here we have two members out of the three secured. As far as these are concerned, the question might be raised to-morrow. It is only when we approach the old home that we are compelled to recognize that it is not yet ripe for reunion. But this can not even be said of all of its members. In one of the islands a proposal to become part of the great British-American nation would be hailed with delight. We can safely say of Ireland: "She is ready."

The position of Scotland in the United Kingdom is that of a small State overshadowed by a great one. She is dissatisfied and is to-day demanding power to govern herself after her own ideas. Her posi-

tion as a State among the proposed States of the great reunion would be more desirable and infinitely more exalted and more independent in every respect than her present position as a State in the small union of England, Ireland, and Wales. And not one particle would she be less distinctively Scotland than she is Scotland to-day. Indeed, she would be more Scotland than she is now Scotland, because the rights which a State in the reunion would hold are the rights of sovereignty. She would be supreme within her borders with a national parliament and full control over her land, her church, her education, and all her national institutions. She would only surrender to a general parliament control of certain stated affairs of an international character. After a short campaign of explanation throughout my native land I am confident we should be able to say of Scotland, "She is ready"; and what Scotland requires is all that Wales requires, when of her we could also say, "She is ready." Her status would also be raised, not depressed, by reentering the greater union. Scotland would be more Scotland, Ireland more Ireland, Wales more Wales than they are at present. What great difference would it make to Wales, Ireland, and Scotland if their representatives to the supreme council should proceed to Washington instead of to London? Yet this is all the change that would be required, and for this they would have insured to them all the rights of independent States and free access to the only market which can make and keep them prosperous.

The sole remaining member is England, and we confess that much has to be accomplished in the way of change before she can be induced to again accept the headship of the race as the oldest and most revered member in a great reunion which, however, she could not expect to dominate as she now dominates the present union of the three small States, containing less than one-third of her own population, which constitute with her the United Kingdom. But the greater union would be one in which although she could not be all-powerful, yet she would undoubtedly be first, and regarded with all the deference due to age and motherhood.

At first glance the Briton who considers this question may feel that the proposed reunion would involve the giving up of his separate nationality, with its unequaled history, its triumphs, and all that makes the sceptered isle the object of his love and admiration. There is nothing whatever in this. Not a line of the long scroll would be dimmed, not a word erased. The past can not be obscured, and the future, under the proposed reunion with the other branches of her own race, may be trusted to be grander than the past, as the power and career of the reunited nation must be greater than that of any of its branches. Officials may be expected to denounce the idea of reunion, fearing that their positions under the new régime would be, not less dignified, but less likely to be theirs. But the people of Britain have no cause to fear that anything would be taken from them, and every reason to see that much would be added. We observe in the history of the world that patriotism is ever expansive. Centuries ago the people of Perugia and Assisi, 15 miles apart, were deadly enemies, attacked each other, and played at making war and treaties. Even St. Francis was wounded in one of these campaigns. The patriotism of the Perugian and the Assisian could not embrace an area so great as 15 miles. To-day patriotism stretches over hundreds of miles, in some cases thousands of miles, and does not lose but gain in intensity as it covers a wider area. There is more to be patriotic about. The patriotism of to-day, which melts when pushed beyond the shores of the island of Britain, may safely be trusted to partake in the near future of the expansive quality. It will soon grow and cover the doings of the race wherever situated, beyond the bounds of the old home. Professor Freeman, under the influence of this wider and nobler patriotism, has already been compelled to declare:

"He is no Englishman at heart, he has no true feeling of the abiding tie of kindred, who deems that the glory and greatness of the child (Republic) is other than part of the glory and greatness of the parent."

National patriotism or pride can not, therefore, prove a serious obstacle in the way of reunion.

It is to be carefully pondered that had separation never occurred it would long since have been necessary for the larger part of the population to be represented in the General Parliament. It is not conceivable that seventy millions of citizens upon one side of the Atlantic would consent to be governed by thirty-eight on the other. If they were so, they would prove themselves most undesirable members of any union. Free-born Britons should have no union with such people. It is because they are British and masterful and will have equality with other Britons that it is desirable or even safe to unite with them. Long ere this, therefore, the representatives of 70,000,000 would be greater in number than the representatives of 38,000,000; and consequently the condition of England or even Britain in this Greater Britain could not have been that of one member overshadowing all the rest. When reunion takes place no one State can have such power. England would be more powerful than any six of the numerous States; but she would not be more powerful than all combined. Nor is it desirable that any one member should be so. If Britain were to stand for this, it would be equivalent to saying that



even if the American Colonies had not seceded she herself would have seceded from them under the policy of rule or ruin and of refusal to consider her fellow citizens as political equals.

Numerous as would be the States comprising the reunited nation, each possessing equal rights, still Britain, as the home of the race, would ever retain precedence—first among equals. However great the number of the children who might sit around her in council, there could never be but one mother, and that mother, Britain.

To resolve to enter no federation of the race in which Britain's vote would not outweigh all the others combined would be to assign to Britain a petty future indeed, since the race can not increase much in the United Kingdom and is certain to be soon numbered by hundreds of millions in America. "Think what we lost when we lost you," said a Briton recently to an American. "Ah," replied the American, "but just think what we lost." "What did you lose?" "Britain," was the reply. This was true; the loss was mutual—as the gain from reunion will be mutual. Each in losing itself will regain the other.

The impediments to reunion may here be mentioned and considered:

First among these the great colonial empire, upon which Britain justly dwells with pride. The colonial, however, is a mere temporary stage in the development of nations. All colonies which prosper and grow ultimately develop into independent states. These always have done so, and they always will. It is certain that Australasia will have a new confederation if she fulfills the expectations of many as to her future growth. If, however, she does not increase in the future faster than she has been doing for sometime, she will no doubt long remain as at present under the protectorate of the old land. There would be no objection to her remaining under the protection of the reunion. The numerous small settlements and dependencies could in like manner also remain. There is, therefore, no valid obstacle in the colonial feature.

India, with its grave responsibilities, remains. No branch of the race now clear of any share in these would willingly consent to become a partner in them. India, called the "Brightest Jewel in the Crown," may be "red" again some day. My experience in India, traveling as an American, gave me an insight into the forces and aspirations of its people which the citizen of the conquering nation is never permitted to obtain. The wisest and most cautious statesmanship alone can lead in peace the two hundred and eighty millions of India to self-government; and much has been done by the education of the people to render the bestowal of self-government upon them inevitable. British occupation of that vast country is necessarily temporary. Britain will ever long be relieved from its dangerous position there. The right of self-government will be granted to the people, who will be ready upon short notice to establish themselves as an independent power. There is really no longer any decided advantage to the parent land in colonies, or in dependencies like India, since there has been conferred upon these freedom of trade with all nations and the right to tax imports, even from the parent land. Britain retains the trade of these regions because she can best supply their wants and this she could do just as completely were they independent. Trade pays no attention to flags; it follows the lowest price current. India, therefore, can soon be placed upon the road to independence and the British-American Union would guide it to this as well as the present Union of the United Kingdom.

The position of Britain in regard to European questions, which might alarm America, is rapidly changing. The doctrine of nonintervention is strong enough, even to-day, to give her practical immunity from participation in European wars. Were Britain part of the Re-United States all that she would be interested about in Europe would be fully secured; namely, the protection of her own soil and the command of the seas. No balance of power, no occupation of Egypt, or any similar question would be of the slightest importance. The reunited nation would be prompt to repel any assault upon the soil or the rights of any of its parts.

The monarchical form of government is admittedly a cause of disunion, but this form is not eterne. Scarcely a session of Parliament passes which does not in some department bring about an assimilation of political institutions to those of Canada and the United States. It is recognized by all that Britain is no longer a government of the few, but has really become in substance a democracy. A house of hereditary legislators is of all present institutions probably destined to have the shortest life in Britain. The House of Lords is not effective as a legislative chamber, even to-day. With its abolition or reform the question of maintaining an hereditary head of the state will follow. The opinion is often expressed in Britain that the Prince of Wales is probably to be the last official sitting by hereditary right. It is said that this opinion has been expressed by the prince himself. From what wise friends who know the prince tell me, I am persuaded that he is the last man in the world to stand in the way of healing a separation which he so constantly deplors, and unless the estimate formed by all, of the patriotism, virtues, and character of Her Majesty herself be strangely awry, she would give up much beyond her crown to be the peacemaker who brought reunion to her race. Strange almost beyond explanation is the fact that this woman, from one point of

view bereft of political power, a mere instrument in the hands of her elected ministers, nevertheless is in this omnipotent. She is the only one who could by a sublime act reunite the separated branches of her race. Never in the history of the world has it been in the power of any human being to perform so great an act, or to secure so commanding a place among "the immortal few who were not born to die." All the saints in the calendar would give place to St. Victoria were Providence to favor her by calling her to perform a mission so fraught with blessing to her people and to the world. There would be but two names set apart forever in the annals of the English-speaking race—names further beyond all other names than any name now known to man is beyond that of all his fellows—Victoria and Washington—patron saints of our race; he the conqueror, who manlike drew the sword in righteous quarrel; she, womanlike, the angel of peace and reconciliation; each adding luster to the other and equal in power and glory.

For such a mission and such a destiny even Queen Victoria on bended knee might pray.

In England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales a proposition to make all officials elective by the people after Victoria passes away, which God grant must be long is the prayer of every American, would command a heavy vote. It is thought by many that the majority would be great, indeed, in all the members of the United Kingdom for the abolition of hereditary legislators. Before the question of reunion is ripe for settlement in England there will remain no trace of hereditary privilege. As the Scotsman some years ago so well said: "Democracy means, and rightly means, that privilege shall cease."

There remains the question of the established church, which at present would create an insuperable obstacle to reunion; but it has already been abolished in one of the members of the United Kingdom and is about to be abolished in another; and it is only a question of a few years ere it be also abolished in Scotland.

This leaves us again with only England as the obstructive member to reunion; but as with the House of Lords, the colonial system, and the monarchy, so with the established church, even in England. What has been adopted in three members of the United Kingdom will finally be adopted in the fourth. The tendency of the age is fatal to making any sect the favorite of the State. Equal protection to all, favor to none, is the doctrine in regard to religious bodies. The question of an established church in the one member, England, therefore, will not exist to prevent reunion.

We might from one point of view consider the idea of "imperial federation" an obstacle to reunion, but it is really a help, for the discussion of that question can only pave the way for the acceptance of the only desirable federation. It needs only to be pointed out to Britain that, granted imperial federation acquired, she would obtain little or no extension of markets and could then only hope to be a member of a union which comprised a very small portion of the race. The growth of the English-speaking race during the last 10 years is ominous when considered in its bearing upon the imperial federation idea. In 1880 a federation of England and her colonies would have contained 42,308,843 people. The population of the Republic at that time was 50,155,783. Contrast now these figures with those of 1890. Imperial federation would have embraced in 1890, 46,437,974. The population of the Republic was then 62,622,250. Thus in 10 short years the American Republic has added twelve and a half millions to its population; the members of the proposed "imperial federation" only four and a quarter millions. The United Kingdom increased only 2,638,000, Canada only 508,000, Australasia—Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales, New Zealand, Tasmania, etc.—combined, only 1,024,193, sundry small settlements the remainder.

Let it be assumed that the two branches increase in the same proportion as for the last 10 years, and

1900 will show:	
Imperial federation	50,600,000
The Republic	78,100,000
1910 will show:	
Imperial federation	55,600,000
The Republic	97,600,000
1920 will show:	
Imperial federation	61,100,000
The Republic	122,000,000
1930 will show:	
Imperial federation	67,200,000
The Republic	152,500,000
1940 will show:	
Imperial federation	73,900,000
The Republic	190,600,000

This will be the result only 50 years hence, when men now in manhood will still be living.

If the estimate be carried forward for 50 years more, making the complete century, the figures will stand:

Imperial federation	119,000,000
The Republic	581,000,000

We have considered here the two parts—Republic and Empire—as two solid bodies, the increase of the Republic, 1880 to 1890, having been 24.87 per cent, the empire's average increase 10 per cent; the United Kingdom's increase—8.17—has been, of course, less than the



average; Canada's increase, 11 per cent, just 1 per cent above the average; and Australasia's percentage of increase much higher, 39 per cent. It is not probable that any of the parts in either empire or Republic will maintain the past rate of increase; especially is it considered improbable by experts that the United Kingdom can increase much, since other countries are becoming better able to supply their own wants. Australasia has only added 1,000,000 in 10 years, and this chiefly in the first years of the decade. Her future, as the home of a great population, is not yet considered quite clear. Canada, under present conditions, is not likely to do more than maintain her slow rate of increase. The Republic seems likely to more nearly keep up its present rate of increase than the others, so that it is quite safe to assume that at least the relative difference between imperial federation and the United States, here indicated, will be maintained.

If Britain, America, and Canada were to reunite to-day, the population of the reunion would be 108,000,000. All the other parts of the English-speaking race would not number 5,000,000. It is into such a complete race reunion of her people that the door is now wide open for the parent land to enter and take first place—first among equals. In view of this high destiny, hers for the asking, who is he among her citizens who can sit down and deliberately plan for his country such a future as these figures prove would be hers under imperial federation. I can not understand how any true Briton can so far forget what is due to the mother land. No patriot surely can or will longer connect himself with a movement which has for its aim so miserable an end. If the imperial federationist be willing to unite with a few millions of people at the antipodes, who will not even entertain the idea of imports under free trade, much less "duty free," what objection can he raise to reunion with the main body of our race, only five days' sail from his shores, who offer not free trade only, which allows taxes upon imports for revenue, but entrance of everything duty free. I confidently appeal to the sterling patriotism which animates the imperial federationists and inspires them with ardent wishes for the future of their land to discard the narrow idea which tends to defeat their dearest hope. I beseech them to come with us who seek the reunion of all.

In the affairs of nations as well as in those of individuals there is a tide which not taken at the flood swings the ship of state from the main channel into the shoals and eddies where future progress is impossible.

It may confidently be expected there will arise in Britain a strong public sentiment protesting against the effort of some to relegate her to a subordinate rôle through an imperial federation which fails to federate the mass of the race.

From a review of the present position of the question we find that even to-day we can say Canada, the United States, and Ireland are ready for reunion; that Scotland presents no great difficulty; neither does Wales, and both have everything to gain and nothing to lose by reunion; and that the causes of continued disunion which admittedly exist in England are rapidly vanishing and are all melting away like snow in the sunshine; the colonial empire, the Indian question, European entanglements present no insuperable obstacle, and hereditary privilege and a national church are doomed. The present generation is to find several of these obstructions abolished; the succeeding generation probably is to find no trace of any of them.

Let no man imagine that I write as a partisan in dealing with these questions. I know no party in this great argument either in America or in Britain. Whatever obstructs reunion I oppose, whatever promotes reunion I favor. I judge all political questions from this standpoint. All party divisions sink into nothingness in my thoughts compared with the reunion of our race.

The ground thus cleared in the only member in which it is now cumbered, there is presented to us the spectacle of three branches of the race, Britain, Canada, and America, formerly united and now enjoying similar institutions but remaining disunited. We seek in vain for any reason why the old quarrel should not be healed, why those separated by a difference which no longer exists should not let the dead past bury its dead, and once more unite as parts of one great whole, just as the two parts of the Republic, plunged into civil war by the question of slavery, have again united in bonds more loving and more enduring than ever; just as Scotland and England, after long wars and separate existence, have been united, to the incalculable advantage of both; just as the Provinces of Canada have united all the three branches in one dominion, having had in their own histories experience of the evils and cost of separation and likewise of the advantages flowing from union. That each should now consider a reunion on a greater scale, and yet only a repetition of what each has already made upon a smaller scale, seems the most natural thing in the world. The residents of any member of the reunited nation will be nearer in time to the common center than the residents of the north of Scotland were to London at the time of the union; nearer than the residents of the extremities of the Republic were to Philadelphia when the Federal Union was formed. And in addition to this the citizen in any part of the new federation, by means of the telegraph, really will sit within the precincts of the Capitol; almost, it might be said,

within hearing of the proceedings of the national councils. Properly viewed, the reunion of the Briton, American, and Canadian will be less of a step forward than was the union of Scotland and England, the union of the Provinces of Canada, or the American Union, the parts to be reunited by such a federation being in every true sense nearer together, and the new empire more compact, than were the parts of either of these three unions at the date of their origin.

The means by which reunion is to be accomplished are ready to hand. There is sitting at this moment in Paris a conference composed of delegates from London, Ottawa, and Washington charged by the three branches of our race to obtain a satisfactory basis for the preservation of the seals in Bering Sea. After their task has been concluded the same distinguished men, each among the foremost citizens of the respective branches, could meet in London and suggest a basis for restoring the union which only a century ago so happily existed between Britain, Canada, and America and made them one nation. It would be so easy a task that its very simplicity amazes and renders us incredulous, but most of the important successes and most valuable discoveries have been remarkable for this very feature.

As easy as Le Cling's setting types, as easy as Franklin's drawing the lightning down, as Newton's divining the meaning of a falling apple, or Galileo of a swinging lamp, or Watts the raising of a kettle lid by the force of the escaping steam, as Spencer's survival of the fittest, as Darwin's origin of species, as Columbus sailing westward, or the making of the American Constitution—the Gordian knot is always easily cut, so easily that the only wonder is that it was not done before. Nothing mysterious, elaborate, or difficult reaches to the root and changes the face of the world, or the trend of events. The road always lies broad, open, straight, obvious to all transcendent successes; there is no hidden, tortuous, and narrow path to anything truly great. Some day, therefore, delegates from the three now separated branches will meet in London and readily agree upon and report for approval and ratification a basis for the restoration of an indissoluble union of indestructible states.

This may all seem Utopian, but we have had many prophetic voices, concerning both Britain and America, more than fulfilled, which were at the time of their inspired utterance much wilder than anything herein suggested. It may be all a dream and I but a mere dreamer of dreams. So be it. But if it be true that he who always dreams accomplishes nothing, so also is it none the less true that he who never dreams is equally barren of achievement. And if it be a dream, it is a dream nobler than most realities. If it is never to be realized, none the less it should be realized, and shame to those who come after us if it be not. I believe it will be, for all progress is upon its side. All that tends to the brotherhood of man tends to promote it. The tendency of the age is toward consolidation. We have behind us and with us, urging its consummation, all the mighty forces of civilization. The parliament of man and the federation of the world have already been hailed by the poet, and these mean a step much farther in advance of the proposed reunion of Britain and America than that reunion is in advance of the Canadian Confederation, of the American Union, or the Union of England and Scotland, all already accomplished.

Readers will kindly note that this is a look ahead—how far ahead I shall not attempt to guess—nevertheless it is ahead, and some time, somehow, it is to come to pass. I see it with the eye of faith, the faith of the devotee which carries with it a realizing sense of certain fulfillment.

Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams, but it shall never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked for and undesired separation of the mother from her child is not to bleed forever.

Let men say what they will, therefore, I say that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again "The Re-United States," "The British-American Union."

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

During the reading of the article,

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ernst	Heflin	McNary
Bingham	Ferris	Howell	Mayfield
Blease	Fess	Johnson	Metcalf
Borah	Frazier	Jones, Wash.	Moses
Brookhart	George	Kendrick	Norbeck
Butler	Gillett	Keyes	Norris
Capper	Goff	King	Nye
Copeland	Gooding	La Follette	Oddie
Curtis	Hale	Lenroot	Overman
Dale	Harris	McKellar	Pepper
Deneen	Harrison	McMaster	Pine



Pittman	Schall	Stanfield	Warren
Reed, Mo.	Sheppard	Swanson	Watson
Reed, Pa.	Shipstead	Trammell	Weller
Robinson, Ark.	Smith	Wadsworth	Wheeler
Sackett	Smoot	Walsh	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The reading of the article from the North American Review having been concluded,

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Missouri desire to conclude his speech to-night?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not.

Mr. CURTIS. Then, if the Senator will yield to me, I will make a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I will be glad to yield.

#### RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I suggest to the Senator that he make it 12 o'clock.

Mr. CURTIS. We can not do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 20, 1926, at 11 o'clock a. m.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, January 19, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name. Wilt thou come to us in the compassion of our heavenly Father. Thou who giveth us all things richly to enjoy, in chastisement and rebuke, remember mercy. Do Thou stoop to our needs and help us to see great things out of Thy law. Grant newness of zeal and opportunity to all. Oh, teach us how the good may prevail and help us to hold onto its achievements. May we hear the call to the higher states of power and blessing. Keep before us not success, not greatness, not victory, but fidelity to the public good, through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LINTHICUM rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland rise?

Mr. LINTHICUM. To ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if it is not to read into the Record a speech by Governor Ritchie, of Maryland, I shall not object; but if it is on that subject, I shall object.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will say to the gentleman that it is not on that subject. If it were on that subject, it could not be done in two minutes. That is not my purpose.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object. It takes up time.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am only asking for two minutes. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may be allowed one minute in which to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWELL. The same objection.

#### NO QUORUM—CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. It is evident that there is no quorum present.

Mr. TILSON. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will summon the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The doors were closed.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 20]

Auf der Heide	Cullen	Haugen	Parks
Barkley	Darrow	Hawley	Phillips
Bell	Davey	Hudson	Purnell
Berger	Deal	Johnson, Ill.	Quayle
Black, N. Y.	Dempsey	Kless	Raker
Bloom	Denison	Kindred	Ransley
Boylan	Dickinson, Iowa	McFadden	Rayburn
Brand, Ohio	Dickstein	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rouse
Brigham	Doyle	McSwain	Sanders, N. Y.
Burdick	Esterly	MacGregor	Somers, N. Y.
Butler	Fredericks	Mead	Spearing
Canfield	Free	Merritt	Sullivan
Carew	Fuller	Morin	Sumners, Tex.
Celler	Gallivan	Norton	Upshaw
Connally, Tex.	Glynn	O'Connell, N. Y.	Wefald
Connolly, Pa.	Golder	O'Connor, La.	Welsh
Cooper, Wis.	Goldsborough	O'Connor, N. Y.	Zihlman
Crowther	Green, Iowa	Parker	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MAPES) was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. LEHLBACH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7554, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7554) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself one hour at first. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, are they to be the gentleman's own remarks or some printed matter?

Mr. FRENCH. They will be my own remarks, though I may use a quotation here and there, or something of that kind; but it will be right on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am going to ask that for a time I be not interrupted, as I shall plan to cover the essential items in the bill and the programs we have had in mind in shaping the recommendations that we bring to your consideration. In that way I think we shall make progress.

To-day we take up consideration of the Navy appropriation bill, and in my opening statement I want to present a sort of general picture of the Navy, of the factors your committee had to take into consideration in shaping the bill, and indicate to you not only the items as we see them involved in the present bill but point out in a general way future policy as it involves appropriations from our Government.

We must have a Navy that is adequate to the country's defense and adequate to such emergencies as it is possible for human foresight to indicate will arise within any near future.

Our program must have relation to the limitation of armament conference treaties and as I see it to the programs of other nations.

Our program must have relation to the finances of the country and to the regard that our Congress must pay to the burden of taxation that rests upon our people.

#### NEED FOR ECONOMY

When the President delivered his message at the beginning of the Congress in December, he used these words:

Economy is the method by which we prepare to-day to afford the improvements to-morrow.

The President in his message called attention to the expenditures of the Government and pointed out that for the present fiscal year the expenditures, exclusive of the Postal Service, will run at approximately \$3,100,000,000, of which amount approximately \$1,920,000,000 may be regarded as representing disbursements on account of past wars, including, of course, pensions, compensations, interest, and such items as that, leaving a balance of approximately \$1,180,000,000 as the cost of the Government for ordinary purposes.

The President then pointed out that the War and the Navy Departments call for \$642,000,000 for the current fiscal year, of which the Navy's share is \$303,000,000. Probably I should say that in addition to this amount an item that was charged to the fiscal year 1925 and carried in the second deficiency act, approved on March 4 of that year, added additional appropriations of \$17,000,000. Possibly every dollar of that amount has been or will be expended not in 1925, but in 1926,\* and a better picture would be given if I would say that for the current year the Navy's share is roundly \$320,000,000.

I believe that the Congress will be interested in a statement showing the direct and indirect appropriations for a period of several years, and I am presenting a table, which I direct to your attention:

Navy expenditures

Year	Appropriations		
	Direct	Indirect	Total
1921.....	\$433,279,574.00		\$433,279,574.00
1922.....	410,673,289.23		410,673,289.23
1923.....	294,873,697.00	\$8,000,000.00	302,873,697.00
1924.....	294,456,528.00	35,450,000.00	329,906,528.00
1925.....	275,105,067.00	22,500,000.00	297,605,067.00
1926.....	302,862,378.00		302,862,378.00
1927 (estimates).....	322,569,430.00	5,000,000.00	327,569,430.00

\* Naval act.

† Maximum.

Please bear in mind that the actual authorized expenditure for 1926 is nearer three hundred and twenty millions on account of the authorization to which I have just referred.

Now, I want to present to the House a table showing the estimated expenditures for 1927 and the expenditures proposed in the bill that we have placed before you:

	Estimated, 1927	Proposed, 1927
Direct appropriations:		
Navy Department.....	\$4,240,070	\$4,282,070
Naval service.....	316,714,960	312,992,717
Total.....	320,955,030	317,274,787
Indirect appropriations, naval service.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
Contract authorizations, naval service.....	4,100,000	9,082,000
Reappropriation, naval service.....	75,000	75,000
Grand total.....	330,130,030	331,431,787

Let me direct attention to one other factor that has to do with the total. Of the amount reported in the present bill the sum of \$4,100,000 becomes necessary to provide for maturing contracts on account of aviation material for which we did not need to appropriate money in the current year. Again the bill carries contract authorizations of \$9,082,000, for which we do not need in 1927 to make direct appropriations of money. This sum includes one item of \$4,100,000 for aviation contracts and another item of \$4,982,000 contract authorization, in addition to a direct appropriation of \$1,000,000 for Pearl Harbor.

So then the bill that we bring to your attention to-day calls for a money appropriation of \$317,274,787. You contrast those figures with the expenditures for the Navy during the last preceding five or six years. You will notice that they are well below the figures for 1921 and 1922. On the other hand, they are slightly above the figures for the current year.

The Members of the Congress will recall that in presenting the naval appropriation bill two years ago I made the statement that at the close of the World War we had on hand a vast amount of naval supplies that happily had not been needed by the time the armistice was signed. I said that for several years following the war we had been drawing upon those supplies and, further, that we had been supplementing the direct appropriations obtained through the sales of supplies in large amounts. In 1924 we supplemented the direct appropriations by indirect appropriations aggregating \$35,450,000. In 1925 our indirect appropriations were \$22,500,000. I told you in presenting the bill for 1925 that we could never look forward to any considerable indirect appropriations for the future because the funds would not be available from which large indirect appropriations could be made. For the current year the bill carried nothing. In the pending bill the amount carried is \$5,000,000, and again I must remind you that in the future the Congress and the country must expect little or no appropriations of indirect character.

Having made this general statement touching the amounts carried in the bill I believe we shall make time if I shall refer to a few items, essential items they are, but which have not received material modification at the hands either of the Budget Bureau or of the committee that has reported the bill.

#### BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

##### OPERATION, UPKEEP, REPAIR, AND IMPROVEMENT

The Budget estimate under this head is \$6,750,000, the same as the current appropriation. The committee proposes an appropriation of \$7,000,000. Out of the 1925 appropriation but \$2,585,517.97 was expended for repairs at the various shore establishments. On property costing originally \$300,989,418, it is quite apparent that some things have had to be neglected. There is no question but that the general policy of retrenchment has caused an accumulation of repair work in the navy yards, some of a character which should not longer be deferred. It is because of this that the committee is proposing to go beyond the Budget to the extent of \$250,000.

#### SALE OF USELESS PROPERTY

With the view to stimulating action on the part of the department the committee is including a provision in the appropriation for "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to submit to Congress at its next session a comprehensive plan for necessary improvements and permanent construction at navy yards, naval stations, and Marine Corps bases, founded on using funds received from the sale of property no longer needed for naval purposes when the sale thereof shall have been authorized. There is a growing need for improvements and permanent construction in both the Navy and Marine Corps and it would seem that useless property offers a way to raise a fund that would in part, at least, defray the cost.

#### PUBLIC WORKS

For specific improvement projects at navy yards and naval stations the Budget proposes appropriations totaling \$2,584,300. The committee propose \$2,635,300, an increase of \$51,000, of which \$15,000 is for correcting the really deplorable condition prevailing at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station by reason of inadequate prison facilities, and the remainder, \$36,000, is for continuing maintenance dredging at the navy yard, Charleston, S. C., for which no funds are carried in the Budget. Conditions at Charleston are such that unless the river in front of the yard is dredged regularly the dry dock at the yard can not be used.

The act approved March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1269), authorized the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with improvement to channel and harbor at the naval station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, at a cost not to exceed \$5,982,000. In pursuance of that authorization the Budget carries an item of \$1,000,000, without authority, intentionally or not, to contract beyond that sum. A project of this sort and size can not be handled economically by letting the work out in piecemeal fashion, and such a course virtually would do away with competition. It is doubtful if continental concerns could be induced to bid if we were to proceed in that way. The committee, therefore, has included in the bill authority to enter into contracts up to the authorized limit of cost.

Another sizable item proposed in the Budget and recommended by the committee covers a general improvement program for the submarine base at Pearl Harbor. This base was inspected by a number of members of the committee during the past summer; and the conditions obtaining there, in their judgment, fully warrant the proposed appropriation of \$480,000.



The act of March 4, 1925, previously referred to, also authorized the Secretary of the Navy to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, such land as he may deem necessary in the vicinity of South Brooklyn, N. Y., known as the third Bush lot, now under lease to the Navy Department, for addition to the site of the naval supply depot, at a cost not to exceed \$330,000. The Budget estimates include \$330,000 to enable the Secretary of the Navy to acquire such property and the committee recommends concurrence. The power plant for the supply depot is situated on the lot in question and the lease to the lot will expire on June 30, 1926. If the owners should refuse to release the property the power plant would be lost. Its removal, it is estimated, would cost more than the purchase price of the land. The improvements on the abutting property, owned by the Navy, have a value in excess of \$6,000,000. This value would be much enhanced if the adjoining property were acquired and would make the entire property more salable should that become desirable in the future.

#### THE MARINE CORPS

For the Marine Corps our estimates are on the basis of continuing the establishment with an average enlisted strength of 18,000 men. The authorized number of officers of the Marine Corps is 1,095, based on the authorized enlisted strength of 27,400 men. The estimates are on the basis of 1,020. The committee is not disturbing the Budget estimates for the Marine Corps except as previously indicated when I discussed the reserve situation generally.

#### BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

Under the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery the committee is proposing, in conformity with the Budget recommendation, to combine the appropriations "Medical Department" and "Contingent, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," under the name of the former. There is considerable overlapping at present, and the change seems to be in the interest of good administration.

The Budget proposes that \$600,000 of the naval hospital fund shall be made available for making certain improvements at existing naval hospitals. The projects, with one exception, are of a nature which takes them out of the committee's jurisdiction, and the committee is not recommending them, although it is believed they have merit. The excepted item provides for the removal of the cemetery at the naval hospital, New York, N. Y. The estimated cost is \$15,000. The committee is proposing that this item be allowed. A bill, H. R. 3959, has been introduced authorizing the projects here referred to.

#### THE NAVAL RESERVE

For the first time the committee feels that it can unqualifiedly indorse the appropriations proposed on account of the Naval Reserve. This is because of the legislation enacted at the last session (43 Stat. 1080), in pursuance of which a complete reorganization is being effected and a definite objective has been established.

The statement of the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation to the committee gives a very clear picture of what is being done and proposed. It is in part as follows:

The drilling units—divisions, battalions, and squadrons—are organized with a definite objective for each unit, and their quotas of officers and men and their forms of organization and the character of their training is all based on this objective, which is the manning and commissioning and joining up with the fleet of certain vessels now out of commission (specified by name for each drilling unit) or, in the case of aviation units, the formation at specified centers of certain specified fighting, bombing, or scouting squadrons. Each officer and man is trained for the duties he will be required to perform on the particular vessel or with the particular squadron to which his unit is attached, and the unit as a whole is trained for this duty. With this plan of organization, and with the reserve crews skeletonized (in order that the money available might be stretched as far as possible), 134 vessels, mostly destroyers, have been designated by name to be thus mobilized by the fleet reserve, and 10 aviation squadrons, comprising 156 planes. The actual number of officers and men required for these duties at mobilization is 1,182 officers and 13,131 men; and in addition to these there are required in the fleet reserve approximately 320 general service officers for the peace-time administration of these various organizations and for general detail in the event of war. The present strength under this classification is 1,059 officers and 5,949 men, but it is expected to bring this number up to 1,188 officers and 8,070 men by July 1, 1926, the process of reorganization still going forward and their being money available in this year's appropriation. Within the limit of funds allowed by the Budget in this appropriation, we are asking for 1,340 officers and 8,070 men for the fiscal year 1927.

The appropriation proposed by the Budget allows for an expansion of 281 officers and 2,121 men over the present strength. If the old reserve be any criterion, that would seem

to be a rather ambitious program. The committee, however, is recommending the Budget estimate for personnel.

The current appropriation on account of the Naval Reserve is \$3,900,000. The Budget estimate for 1927, including a supplemental estimate on account of reserve aviation of \$230,000, but exclusive of the supplemental recommendation for a reappropriation of \$75,000 also on account of reserve aviation, is \$3,830,000. The original estimate of \$3,600,000 was predicated upon withdrawing 28 of the 55 vessels at present assigned to training Naval Reserves, ostensibly because of the announced intention of the department to give more training on vessels of the regular Navy. It is true also that many of the vessels now assigned are unseaworthy and are unfit for uses other than the conduct of drills while at anchor. The department is averse to taking out so many vessels, but the committee is advised that even with an amount sufficient to keep them all in their present status the department, of its own accord, would withdraw a number of them. A list of the reserve districts and units and of the vessels assigned appears in the hearings, commencing on page 348. Of the units therein listed, 48 have no vessel at all, although it is true that 25 of the 48 are so situated that they may avail themselves of vessels assigned to other units.

The point is, however, that there are not enough vessels to go around, and discrimination would continue whether any or all should be taken out. The committee, however, feels that since the Naval Reserve has just begun, it might be said, to "get somewhere," it hardly would be the right thing to interfere with the plans of the department, at least to the extent that would be necessary under the Budget proposal. The committee therefore has raised the Budget estimate by \$190,000 for the exclusive purpose of continuing the assignment of a greater number of vessels to reserve units.

#### RESERVE AVIATION

As appears in Admiral Shoemaker's statement, *supra*, the reserve organization plans look to the development of reserve aviators for 10 aviation squadrons, comprising 156 planes. Here also a definite objective is in view. The original Budget estimate fell short of providing for a sufficient number of trainees and a sufficient amount of flying time in the view of those responsible for the administration of this phase of reserve work. A supplemental estimate has been presented which meets these objections by providing for the desired amount of flight training; a larger reserve of aviation mechanics, so as to relieve qualified and student aviators from such work, that they may put all of their time into flight practice and training, and also to keep the maximum number of planes in condition for such flight and practice training; the training of a larger number of student aviators, and providing for the acquisition of five additional training planes exclusively for reserve training. The committee is proposing complete allowance of the supplemental estimate.

The hearings on this subject lend encouragement to the plan suggested herein under the head of "Aviation" as to looking elsewhere than the Naval Academy for our supply of air pilots. With proper inducements no difficulty should be experienced.

#### MERCHANT MARINE RESERVE

The Naval Reserve law impliedly left to future determination whether or not members of this branch of the Naval Reserve, consisting of male citizens who follow or who have followed the sea as a profession, should be allowed pay simply for performing their regular duties because of their affiliation with the reserve. The committee is proposing that the appropriation of \$23,540 recommended in the Budget for this purpose be not granted. While this is a relatively small amount, where the practice would lead to no one can say.

#### THE FLEET RESERVE

The appropriation proposed by the Budget and recommended by the committee for the Naval Reserve carries no money for the pay of transferred members of the Fleet Reserve, composed of men who have had 16 or more years of naval service. At the time of the hearings there was a total of 6,534 transferred reservists, who are paid from "Pay of the Navy." There is included in the proposed appropriation on account of such reservists \$6,807,660, which is \$113,500 more than recommended in the Budget, being necessary to provide full compensation for the transferred fleet reservists recalled to active duty with their own consent to act in the capacity of shipkeepers for vessels assigned for training reservists. The Budget contemplated that no transferred men should act in the capacity of shipkeepers. The committee feels that it is in the interest of economy and efficiency to continue the existing practice. As a result of this course the reserve appropriation



has been reduced by \$175,600, which was carried therein for the pay of reserve shipkeepers on the assumption that transferred reservists would be withdrawn.

Like the Navy, the Marine Corps also has a transferred reserve list, composed of men who have had 16 or more years of service. There were 262 such Marine Corps reservists at the time of the hearings on account of whom the Budget carries \$185,480. The committee is proposing the Budget estimate.

#### RESERVES GENERALLY

The committee believes that the attention of the House should be called to the reserve situation generally. That the reserves have a necessary and important place in our scheme of national defense there is no question. That there should be a limit, however, there should be no question. To keep it within proper limits under existing law seems to fall to the lot of this committee, which should not be. Unless it is watched, and closely watched, it will expand to the point where we will have accomplished by indirection what we have always striven to avoid directly, and that is the establishment of a large force in this country possessing military views and tendencies which will outnumber and outweigh in voice our Regular Establishments. This is not believed to be an overstatement of what may be reasonably expected if we should fail to watch the situation closely. At the last session of Congress a new Naval Reserve law was enacted. Under the terms of that law the Secretary of the Navy has the power to assign every enlisted man of the Navy and Marine Corps, with their consent, to the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, respectively, upon the expiration of their enlistments, and to pay them \$25 each per annum. The possible effect of that law is obvious. The same law provided a Reserve Officers' Training Corps for the Navy and for the Marine Corps patterned after the Reserve Officers' Training Corps of the Army. The committee is proposing with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps of the Navy to reduce the initial appropriation recommended in the Budget from \$45,000 to \$40,000 and to refuse completely the initial appropriation proposed in the Budget of \$12,500 for the corresponding Marine Corps contingent. The Marine Corps has now on active duty practically its full quota of regular officers on its authorized strength of 27,400 men.

#### NAVAL AVIATION

The committee was fortunate to have the benefit of the fund of information developed by recent discussions, inquiries, and investigations in considering the fiscal requirements of this highly important phase of naval activity. In the report of the "President's Aircraft Board," dated November 30, 1925, the board says:

We find nothing but praise of the personnel engaged in naval aviation. The matériel at its disposal is likewise generally of high grade, as is shown by the almost total abstinence of criticism of matériel by the naval witnesses who appeared before us. \* \* \* We believe that the quality of our naval personnel and of its equipment is at least the equal of, and in certain directions superior to, that of any other power.

What the board says finds ample corroboration in the committee's rather exhaustive inquiry into conditions and requirements, which shows a very gratifying situation to prevail. Improvement is going forward under the terms of the appropriation act now current and further progress will be made under the terms of the accompanying bill.

#### PERSONNEL

A supply of trained pilots, and more particularly the source of supply, is the only real problem confronting naval aviation at this time. No shortage exists to-day, but we should not delay preparing for to-morrow. Full cooperation between surface and air forces is dependent upon officers of the line being schooled in the air arm. It is a matter of administration to accomplish this, subject to funds being available. Whether the line officer, though, should be the pilot of a plane, and we should look to the Naval Academy for our future supply, is a matter for serious reflection. Unquestionably, squadrons and wings and other flight formations should be commanded by line officers who have qualified as aviators, and observers, too, should be qualified Naval Academy graduates, but the matter of plane operators is one which the committee feels should be studied and solved by the appropriate legislative committee before the department proceeds too far under existing law in settling the issue itself.

In the matter of increasing the number of pilots from the enlisted personnel, either of the Navy or of the Marine Corps, your committee found that while there are at this time about 90 qualified pilots within the enlisted men's ratings of the Navy and about 17 from the enlisted personnel of the Marine

Corps, the officers from the Bureau of Aeronautics indicated that it would be quite desirable to increase the number of pilots from the enlisted personnel to about 150 upon the basis of present study touching effective work that could be done by enlisted men. This question is one that the committee feels at this time should be handled within the department, and especially in view of the direct study that is being given to the subject.

The committee ventures to suggest the establishment of a new grade of "flight ensign" in the Navy, to be composed of men who will enlist for duty as naval aviators for a period of four years and who will at the same time, should they not reenlist, agree to serve in the Naval Reserve for a further period of four years. Flight ensigns, it is suggested, should rank with but after ensigns of the line of the Navy, should receive corresponding pay and allowances plus flying pay, be given reenlistment gratuities and the right to transfer to the Naval Reserve after 20 years' service, and the right to retirement after 30 years' service.

The committee's study of the subject leads it to believe that this plan would attract to the service high-grade young men of a caliber who would become as proficient as Naval Academy graduates and with equal facility; it would take away from the line of the Navy a minimum number of officers, ultimately diminishing the number at present assigned to aviation; it would create a corps of specialists rather than a force composed of men who would be in aviation to-day and in some other branch of the naval profession to-morrow, and at the same time avoid the problems of pay, rank, selection, etc., which would go with a line officer force; it would create a reserve of trained naval aviators and make available to the industry and commercial aviation a reservoir of skilled material, and, when in full swing, should lessen or dispense with the need for training men as aviators in the Naval Reserve, which ultimately would be composed of men already trained and with practical service experience. Of course, it is recognized that this plan involves other questions for determination and settlement, but the committee suggests it as a basis for solving the supply question of trained aviators and, at the same time, as a means for freeing officers who are or will be required in other fields of naval activity.

The following table shows the situation to-day with respect to qualified aviators and the estimated future requirements:

	Nov. 1, 1925	Required to man 1926 force operating plan	Estimate when peace require- ment of planes will have been realized
Officers:			
Navy—			
Line.....	1371	1389	1,289
Warrant.....	25	15	
Marine Corps—			
Line.....	43	56	56
Warrant.....	1	2	2
Enlisted men:			
Navy.....	90	65	215
Marine Corps.....	17	25	25
Total.....	547	552	1,587

<sup>1</sup> Includes 7 observers.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 15 observers.

It is needless to say that if the ultimate number is to come from the Naval Academy it not only will be necessary to increase the number of appointments to the academy but to increase the authorized number of commissioned officers of the line and perhaps to change the distribution in grade law. No matter confronts the Congress affecting the Navy of greater importance than aviation personnel.

Funds are included in the accompanying bill adequate to take care of the officer and enlisted personnel who will be assigned to aviation during the ensuing fiscal year and fully to carry out the plans of the department pertaining to reserve aviation, which, it might be observed, should prove a splendid auxiliary for recruiting the force of "flight ensigns" above suggested.

#### HEAVIER THAN AIR

A very comprehensive picture of the naval heavier-than-air situation, at present and projected, will be found commencing on page 629 of the hearings. It indicates our full peace requirements as 546 planes for service afloat and 509 for service ashore, a total of 1,115 planes, including 231 planes for the two aircraft carriers under construction, which are being provided



from another appropriation—Increase of the Navy. The 1,115 planes include a reserve of 371 planes for replacing damaged, condemned, or planes temporarily out of commission. The table also indicates a general allocation of the planes. It should be remarked that the program is now under consideration by the Navy General Board and that it has not been approved by the board in its present form. The committee suggests that here, too, the appropriate legislative committee might find need for legislation. It would seem desirable that a program should be established by Congress and with the aid of the Bureau of the Budget a time prescribed for its fulfillment. The committee has endeavored to get an approximation of what naval aviation would cost, directly and indirectly, should the department's peace-time requirements be realized. The figure is given (hearings, p. 655) as \$63,099,020. This exceeds the comparable 1925 expenditures by about \$28,000,000. This is mentioned not in discouragement of aviation development but to emphasize the importance of determining without delay an economical policy, both as to personnel and matériel, consistent with actual needs.

#### LIGHTER THAN AIR

The naval lighter-than-air equipment is listed on page 758 of the hearings. It shows that we have 2 obsolete nonrigid airships and 30 obsolete kite balloons. We have but 1 rigid dirigible, the *Los Angeles*, built in Germany, which came to us under diplomatic negotiations on the assurance that it would be devoted to civil purposes. Its chief value to the Navy at this time is the training of officers and men in the handling of this type of aircraft.

The *Los Angeles* is housed in the hangar at Lakehurst, N. J. The annual cost of maintaining Lakehurst under present normal conditions is \$1,716,500. The question simply resolves itself into whether or not we are justified in maintaining this establishment on account of a dirigible restricted to civil uses. The Navy is desirous of building a dirigible larger than the *Los Angeles*—possibly two and one-half or three times as large in gas capacity. If the Congress should authorize such an airship we are told that it would take approximately four years to complete it. Are we justified in spending at the rate of \$1,716,500 annually for the next four years, or a total of \$6,866,000, to provide training for an operating complement for such a vessel, not even authorized? The committee is proposing that we do not, that we free for general duty the 470 officers and men at the station and that the station be closed down. It would cost in a closed down status approximately \$128,000 a year. The direct saving would be \$717,000 a year.

The accident to the *Shenandoah* has not influenced the view of the committee as to the potentialities of rigid airships for commercial and naval uses, and it is not proposing that we shall abandon lighter-than-air development. A commercial firm has been experimenting with a metal-clad type of airship and is ready, with Government aid, to build an experimental ship of about 200,000 cubic-foot capacity. It is the development of an American idea and, so far as the committee can find out, offers a reasonable chance of success.

The committee is advised that if it should prove successful private enterprise will take hold and that we might look to an increasing number thenceforward. We were also told that the characteristics of such a ship would not be materially different from ships that would be used by the military services and that in time of war it would be merely a matter of outfitting the civilian complements with service uniforms. That is a rather optimistic outlook, but an examination of the hearings will disclose that it has some basis. We have had our experience with the *Shenandoah*; we have had considerable experience with the *Los Angeles*. Private enterprise offers something entirely new. As to the larger types of fabric-covered rigids, we can profit by Great Britain's experience. She is now building two 5,000,000 cubic-foot airships. It seems to the committee that if we can reasonably look to private enterprise for our rigid airships in time of war, we might as well get out of the rigid airship field and put the savings to other needed uses. The experiment with the metal clad will cost the Government approximately \$300,000 and the ship will become the property of the Government. The committee has increased the Budget estimate for experimental and development work in all types of aircraft by the sum of \$300,000, so that the Navy may be free to conclude an agreement looking to carrying the metal-clad experiment to a successful conclusion.

#### ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS

The estimate submitted for "Aviation, Navy, 1927," is \$18,900,000, which includes \$4,100,000 to satisfy obligations incurred under the authorization in the current appropriation act to enter into contracts involving future payments up to that amount. For ordinary and new undertakings, therefore, the

estimate carries \$14,800,000, compared with \$14,790,000 for the current fiscal year, but, following the practice of a year ago, another contract authorization of a like sum—\$4,100,000—is proposed, so that actually for the current fiscal year and for the next year, on the basis of the estimate, just short of \$19,000,000 has been allotted to naval aviation, exclusive of pay and allowances of personnel, aircraft carriers and planes therefor, and reserve aviation. The total outlay may be approximated from the table appearing on pages 724 and 725 of the hearings. It will run close to \$44,000,000, including construction work on and planes for the aircraft carriers, but excluding the pay and subsistence of the operating crews of aircraft tenders and the aircraft carrier *Langley*.

The committee is recommending the adoption of the estimate with the exceptions heretofore indicated; i. e., \$717,000 less by reason of closing down Lakehurst and \$300,000 more for experimental and development work, making a net reduction of \$417,000. Reserve aviation is discussed elsewhere in this report.

Of the total sum proposed, \$9,062,000 will be applied to new aircraft and equipment, apart from aircraft for the two new carriers, including the satisfaction of obligations incurred under the authorization contained in the current appropriation act, and in addition it is provided that orders for new planes may be placed to the total value of \$4,100,000. What this will accomplish is best explained by the statement of Admiral Moffett, appearing in the hearings, as follows:

It is proposed to purchase during the fiscal year 1927 24 fighting planes (VF) and 113 combined torpedo, bombing, and scouting planes (VS-T-B).

If the appropriation is passed as proposed the total number of planes available on July 1, 1928 (the delivery date assumed for all planes purchased with 1927 funds) will be 556 as opposed to 561 on July 1, 1925. There will, however, be one marked difference, and that is that on July 1, 1928, all planes available, except training planes, will be of types which were designed for use with the fleet as well as for duty at stations. This will permit of the formation of squadrons of planes of the same type and all of recent design. The result will be that while not greater in total numbers available, naval aviation will be much improved as to types and can increase to a small extent the number of planes in commission.

Assuming that the amount requested will be appropriated, the following will be the principal increase over the existing organization by July 1, 1928. The squadrons of observation planes on the battleships of the Scouting Fleet will be increased from 6 to 12, and a new squadron of 12 fighting planes will be placed on the same ships. Coco Solo will be increased from 11 planes to 54 planes, which will give an operating allowance of two 18-plane squadrons plus the usual 50 per cent reserve. Pearl Harbor will be increased from 25 to 54 planes, giving, as at Coco Solo, an operating allowance of two 18-plane squadrons. The eight obsolete planes now at Guam will be replaced by eight modern planes. These increases will, of course, be partially as a result of current appropriations.

These increases can be brought about, as mentioned before, by the fact that the numbers of types of planes will be greatly reduced and practically all the planes can then be used and still maintain homogeneous squadrons.

The Navy has gotten out of the business of manufacturing airplanes. Its factory at Philadelphia is devoted chiefly to the repair and overhaul of flying material. The development of experimental types of flying craft is undertaken there. When attended by success production orders are placed with private manufacturing plants. The industry has been greatly stimulated by the enlarged program launched the present fiscal year.

#### MAJOR FACTORS

Now, I ask the House to consider the major factors within the pending bill, and especially with relation to authorized or proposed building programs and the essential policies your committee has recommended looking to the future.

I have told you that the pending bill carries direct appropriations in the amount of \$317,274,787, and indirect appropriations and authorizations amounting to \$14,157,000 more, or a total of \$331,431,787 for the Navy for 1927. I have told you that the Congress has authorized new building and that programs for new building of ships are being urged upon the Congress.

The last Congress authorized a building program that referred to gunboats, to eight cruisers, to an increase of limitation of cost upon aircraft carriers, and there remains with us an uncompleted program that has been authorized for fleet submarines. More than that, under the Limitation of Armament Conference, the United States was authorized to construct aircraft-carrier tonnage in a total of 135,000 tons.

Of that amount, we have completed one carrier, the *Langley*, of 12,700 tons, and we have approaching completion two carriers, the *Saratoga* and the *Lexington*, that will be completed probably within a year, with 66,000 tons; a total tonnage of 78,700. That leaves us available for future construction of airplane carriers 56,300 tons.

To meet the program of submarines, of cruisers, of airplane carriers that already is indicated either through authorization of the Congress or by the limitation of armament treaty will require an expenditure of approximately \$237,000,000. How rapidly that program will need to be developed it is for the administration and the Congress to determine. If it shall mean a program to be completed in five years, then it will call for new appropriations for construction of \$47,000,000 annually. But that is not all. We are told by experts of the Navy that we need more cruisers than those that the Congress has already authorized. The Bureau of Aeronautics desires to construct a giant lighter-than-air craft that will involve five or six million dollars, and a bill providing for authorization of such a ship is before the naval legislative committee.

But that is not all. If the present bill shall not be materially modified we shall have at the end of the fiscal year 1927 approximately 708 airplanes of all kinds, including a current total of 567 tactical planes fit for use on shore and at sea, and not including 143 planes that may roughly be described as suitable for training or that are experimental in character or to the extent of five or six that are obsolete or obsolescent. But the Bureau of Aeronautics estimates that the peace-time requirements should be 1,115 planes and that a program to attain this peace-time requirement in planes alone should be met within about three years, or, in other words, that during that period 438 planes, in addition to ordinary replacement on account of obsolescence or elimination from service during the next three years, ought to be added to the aviation service of the Navy Department. Some of these planes will cost as high as \$72,500. Probably no one will cost less than \$30,000. In the current bill for 215 planes we are providing \$12,358,750, or at the rate of \$57,000 per plane on an average. Were we to provide the 438 planes that the Bureau of Aeronautics recommends in its program, in addition to ordinary replacement during the three years following the present fiscal year, it would mean, on the basis of costs for the current year, an additional amount for building program of more than \$25,000,000.

Gentlemen of the Congress, when you abstract one feature alone of a great bill such as the naval appropriation bill you may think it looks small. But when you assemble a number of parts, or when you bring together the combined program, these individual parts that are not so large within themselves come to assume tremendous importance and call for money appropriations that aggregate hundreds of millions of dollars. These are things that your committee was compelled to take into consideration in the framing of the bill. We must look ahead. We see commitments and we must take them into account. If you provide for one additional cruiser, or one additional submarine, or one additional airplane carrier, or even one additional airplane, it means additional money for fuel, it means additional money for engineering, for repair and ordnance, it means additional money for officers and men.

One of the many items in the bill that we have reported carries \$125,000 for the maintenance of a certain naval station in an inoperative basis instead of an active basis that would call for approximately \$1,716,000. The paper that I have in my hand tells that as to that one item alone on one day 500 telegrams from employees were sent to the Congress protesting against the action.

All over the country there is a more or less definitely organized program for increasing the Naval Establishment. New yards are wanted where they do not exist to-day or where their activities are small. Naval stations that do exist are being used as a basis for increased demand upon the Public Treasury. Chambers of commerce, commercial bodies, or groups of one kind or another are pressing individual programs that, if they were to be cared for in this bill, would add many millions of dollars to the program for the coming fiscal year.

It is fair to the House that I tell you thus bluntly and briefly of the facts so that Members may give the cooperation and the support that I believe the painstaking care with which we have gone into the estimates that have come before our committee and the demands from all sides that have been pressed upon us would seem to warrant.

#### SHIPS

Having made the statement that I have just concluded, may I again repeat the words of the President?—

Economy is the method by which we prepare to-day to afford the improvements to-morrow.

A naval establishment that requires an annual expenditure for its maintenance in excess of around \$300,000,000 can not be inefficient, can not be unworthy, can not be beneath the dignity of the United States, if those charged with its administration are consecrated to its well-being, as I know they are.

The chief criticisms that have been directed against the bill that we have reported are twofold; on the one hand it is urged we have not been generous enough, and on other it is urged that we have been too generous. Under the limitation of armament treaty we are entitled to 18 battleships, 15 of which are in full commission and 3 of which are undergoing major overhauling in response to the modernization program that was authorized by the last Congress. The three battleships that are now undergoing overhauling will take their places in the fleet and the three other battleships whose modernization was provided for will take their places in the yards and will be available for entrance to the fleet shortly after the fiscal year 1927. We have 17 cruisers in full commission, including 10 new cruisers of the first line. We have 103 destroyers in full commission as of December 12 and 88 submarines, including 4 fleet submarines of the first line and 48 submarines of smaller type. We have a total of 324 vessels in commission as of December 10 last. At this point I want to insert the table that was furnished to the committee by the Navy Department indicating the types of vessels in commission during the fiscal year and the types estimated for in the Budget for 1927. Following that table I shall insert another table indicating the vessels not in commission in the current year and not to be in commission under the Budget estimates for 1927:

Vessels in commission

	1926	1927
Battleships:		
First line.....	15	15
First line (reduced complement).....	3	3
Cruisers, second line.....	4	4
Light cruisers:		
First line.....	10	10
Second line.....	3	3
Aircraft carriers:		
First line.....	—	2
Second line.....	1	1
Mine layers, second line.....	2	2
Destroyers, first line.....	103	103
Light mine layers.....	6	6
Submarines:		
First line.....	48	48
Second line.....	32	29
Fleet submarines, first line.....	4	4
Patrol vessels:		
Eagles.....	3	3
Gunboats.....	9	12
Converted yachts.....	6	6
Auxiliaries:		
Destroyer tenders.....	6	6
Submarine tenders.....	7	7
Aircraft tender.....	1	1
Repair ships.....	2	2
Store ships.....	2	2
Colliers.....	2	2
Oilers.....	8	8
Ammunition ship.....	1	1
Cargo ships.....	3	3
Transports.....	2	2
Hospital ships.....	2	2
Fleet tugs.....	7	7
Mine sweepers.....	26	24
Miscellaneous.....	5	5
Fish Commission vessel.....	1	1
Total.....	324	324

Vessels not in commission

	1926	1927
Cruisers, second line.....	6	6
Light cruisers, second line.....	8	8
Mine layers, second line.....	2	2
Destroyers:		
First line.....	161	161
Second line.....	8	8
Light mine layers.....	8	8
Submarines:		
Second line.....	33	36
First line.....	2	2
Fleet submarines, first line.....	2	2
Patrol vessels, converted yachts.....	2	2
Auxiliaries:		
Destroyer tenders.....	3	3
Submarine tenders.....	2	2
Repair ships.....	1	1
Store ships.....	3	3
Colliers.....	3	3
Oilers.....	10	10
Ammunition ships.....	1	1
Cargo ships.....	3	3
Hospital ships.....	1	1
Ocean tugs.....	9	6
Mine sweepers.....	9	11



## Vessels not in commission—Continued

	1926	1927
Patrol vessels:		
Eagles.....	31	31
Submarine chasers.....	5	3
Unclassified.....	9	9
Ferry boats and launches.....	1	1
Ambulance boats.....	1	1
District patrol vessels.....	2	2
Harbor tugs.....	4	3
Crane ship No. 1 (ex-Kearsarge).....	1	1
Total.....	330	333

Your committee has reduced somewhat the appropriation for the maintenance of vessels in active commission, and the economies that we believe can be attained through our proposed reduction will aggregate in saving to the Treasury \$1,782,000, distributed among such items as engineering, construction and repair of vessels and fuel and transportation.

## THE NAVY PERSONNEL

The authorized enlisted strength of the Navy is 137,485. Upon this authorized strength is based the number of line officers. As of October 1, 1925, we had 8,312 officers, of which number 4,837 were line officers out of a total authorization of 5,499. Your committee has always taken the position that we ought to maintain a fairly large officer personnel regardless of the peace-time number of enlisted men, for the reason that it takes years to train officers in comparison with a few months necessary for the training of enlisted men. The Naval Academy is the sole source of supply to the Navy of line officers. The classes that will graduate in 1926 and in 1927 are large classes, that were appointed when, on account of war expansion, Senators and Members of the House were authorized to maintain five midshipmen at the academy. During the last fiscal year 243 line officers were lost to the service, of which number resignations aggregated 115. The members of your committee believe that if the department will tighten up on resignations for the next couple of years and turn all graduates from the academy into the line except those required for the construction corps, the peace-time authorization of line officers will be approximately attained by the end of the fiscal year 1928.

## ENLISTED MEN

As of September 30, 1925, we had a strength in enlisted men of 81,702. The Budget estimates for the current year were upon the basis of 86,000 men, and the committee and the Congress allowed the estimates to care for this number. The committee pointed out, however, that this sum might prove inadequate if men were distributed among the several grades so as to provide a somewhat more satisfactory distribution as was desired by the Bureau of Navigation. The reason why we have 81,702 men in the service to-day as against 86,000 is accounted for in small degree on account of a distribution in grades. By far the larger portion of the reduction occurs by reason of three of the battleships being laid up for modernization. These three battleships when in the service under peace complements require approximately 3,600 men. In their present condition they require but one-fourth that number, or 900 men, and hence we have an immediate reduction of 2,700 men not needed for the maintenance of the Navy. During the entire period of 1927 the three battleships that are now out of commission, or their successors in modernization, will be laid up. So, then, upon this basis alone the bill as it came to us from the Budget carried reductions for enlisted men to care for 83,000 during 1927. The bill as it has been reported to you provides for 82,000 men, 1,000 less than the Budget estimates, and the members of your committee believe that this number is abundantly adequate to meet the situation. I shall tell you why.

In the first place, 81,702 are caring for the situation to-day, and it is actual needs that we should consider rather than the fetish of a definite number. In the second place, two programs are recommended by the committee for 1927, by the adoption of which men will be found.

If we turn to Great Britain, which is the only other nation that under the Limitation of Armament Conference has a ratio equal to our own, we find that that country is undertaking economies that we can not overlook. Great Britain is entitled to 18 battleships just as is the United States, but in lieu of 18 battleships equal to our own she was granted 18 of the type that she had plus 4 battle cruisers, a total of 22. Two battleships that were being built at the time of the limitation conference will be added to the British fleet probably within about a year, and other battleships, or their equivalents, will be subtracted. To-day Great Britain has the

authority to maintain 18 battleships in full commission and 4 battle cruisers. Is she maintaining them? One of the battleships is out of commission for repair. So also is one of the battle cruisers. That would leave her 17 battleships and 3 battle cruisers that are not undergoing repair. But she is not maintaining them in commission. Instead of that, in view of the necessity for economies, she has placed four of her battleships in reserve and she is maintaining but two of her four battle cruisers in commission. One of the others is undergoing repair and the fourth is held in reduced complement. In other words, not counting a battleship and a battle cruiser that Great Britain has that are undergoing repair, she is withholding out of full commission one battle cruiser and three of her battleships. Turn to the destroyer type of ship and what is Great Britain doing? She had 183 destroyers as of October 1, 1925. Of this number, only 54 were in commission as against 106—I assume should be 103—from the same table as of October 1, 1925, for the United States. On that same date Great Britain was maintaining 34 cruisers in commission as against 18 by the United States. Of light-mine layers, we were maintaining 6 and Great Britain 9. Of first-line submarines, we were maintaining 49 in full commission and Great Britain only 20. Of second-line submarines, we were maintaining 32 against Great Britain's 19. We were maintaining two fleet submarines as against seven for Great Britain of that type and in addition one cruiser submarine and one submarine of monitor type. So then, by a comparison of essential ships of the fleets, Great Britain is following a far more conservative course than are we, and her course must be reflected in expenses for men, expenses for fuel, for engineering, for construction and repair.

Bearing in mind also the general burden that Great Britain is carrying in connection with such vessels as gunboats of 500 to 3,000 tons and river gunboats, Great Britain feels compelled to maintain 51 in commission as against 9 for the United States, and we must recognize that these are types that from the standpoint of the naval strength of the respective countries in a large way count for almost nothing.

If, then, Great Britain finds it to her best interests to practice economy, why should not the United States consider measures along the same line? We have in mind that within just about one year from now two airplane carriers, the *Lexington* and *Saratoga*, will enter our Navy as finished ships. These two ships will require more than 2,300 men. That means that we shall be face to face with the question of adding enlisted personnel to our Naval Establishment in addition to those that we already have, if we are to care for these ships, unless we find the men to man them within the ships of the Naval Establishment as it is to-day.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In view of the gentleman's statement, how does he account for the fact that the British Navy is manned by 104,000 officers and men and we are manned by only 90,000 officers and men?

Mr. FRENCH. The question of the gentleman from Georgia is pertinent; it goes right to the heart of the matter, and it ought to be discussed at this time. The committee obtained from the department the figures touching the personnel maintained by Great Britain, by the United States, by Japan, by France, and by Italy. The gentleman has suggested that Great Britain maintains 104,000 plus of officer and enlisted personnel. Let us analyze the figures and see where we arrive. The United States, as of October 1 last, had 8,312 officers and 81,702 enlisted men. In addition to that we had 2,500 men from the marines assigned to duty upon ships.

Were it not for that assignment it would require a replacement from the enlisted personnel of the Navy of an equivalent number. In addition to that there are one or two other factors that I will come to in a few minutes, but I want to show you what the British situation is. The British have 7,839 officers in the regular navy; that is, the Royal Navy. In addition to that there are several hundred officers in the Australian, the Canadian, the New Zealand, and South African navies, making a total of 8,846—not such a bad comparison when you place it alongside of ours. Great Britain has 82,847 men in her regular navy; added to that she has 8,918 more in the navies of the different Provinces which belong to the Empire, or a total of 91,765 enlisted men. But in the figures that the gentleman cites are 4,157 men who are civilians, who are not enlisted men of the navy but who are employed in various kinds of work, on transport and cargo ships. It is hardly fair that these men be included as a part of the British naval establishment. The report that the Navy Department furnished our committee shows that the British maintain 68.77 per cent of their men afloat, while our Navy maintains afloat 75.3 per cent.



Take the number in the British Navy—95,922, excluding officers—and apply the 68.77 per cent figure and you have 65,965 men. But included in that number are 4,157 civilians. Subtract that number from the British total afloat and you have brought the British enlisted personnel down to 61,808 men. Remember that figure. Now, take the American Navy and what do we find? We had 81,702 enlisted personnel as of about the same date as quoted by the British figures, and 75.3 per cent are afloat. That means that of our enlisted men we have 61,521 men afloat. You have almost the same figures as the British figures, there being a difference of less than 300 men between the two establishments afloat.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Does the gentleman mean by men afloat the men who are actually on the ships at all times?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes. Now I will tell you why the 4,157 ought to be subtracted. One year ago it was brought to the attention of our committee upon the recommendation of the department that we ought to provide more money for freight and transportation and less money for the maintenance of certain transports or cargo ships. We complied with the recommendation, and we are paying to-day vastly more than is Great Britain in transportation and freight. Does the gentleman think we ought to include the conductors, firemen, engineers, brakemen, and everybody included in all the railway establishments engaged in hauling the men and personnel throughout the United States from navy yards to naval stations and thereby saving personnel in the fleet on the seas? Yet the gentleman included more than 4,000 men engaged in the same type of work and included in the British personnel but employed on naval-owned craft.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman aim to suggest to the House that we man our railroad trains with enlisted seamen?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman's question indicates that he probably has the same opinion I have of including the British civilians. Of course we would not man our railroad trains with enlisted men, and therefore we ought not to include the 4,000 civilian Britishers who are hauling fuel, oil, and people around in the Navy as a part of the British Navy personnel.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman knows much better than I do that the British Navy is composed of 94,000 enlisted men while our Navy is composed of 81,000 men. In the name of heaven, with the 5-5-3 treaty ratio, why should we have 10,000 or 12,000 men less than Great Britain? The gentleman has always been in favor of the reduction of personnel. Four years ago he brought in a bill to provide for an appropriation to take care of 68,000 or 67,000 men; the Congress overwhelmingly defeated that bill, and it went on record then for 86,000 men, and it is going on record again for 86,000 men, less 3,000 men, as recommended by the Budget. You gentlemen have cut the Budget and cut the desires of the Navy Department and of every expert of the Navy Department 1,000 men, and you have done it arbitrarily. The gentleman is trying to show some reason for it, but up to the present time he has not done so.

Mr. FRENCH. In the first place, the gentleman from Illinois says that I know the British maintain an enlisted personnel of 94,000.

I had just stated that that was not the fact. I had just stated that the British personnel includes 4,000 plus for men who are civilians, who on the records furnished by our Navy Department are indicated as civilians, and yet are included in the British personnel.

Mr. BRITTEN. Well, deduct that from the total and you will still have 93,000 men.

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no; the gentleman is wrong in his mathematics. But let me call attention to one or two other factors that will help to take care of the situation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. PERKINS. May I ask the gentleman a question there?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me answer this other question first. The gentleman might think I did not want to answer his question.

Mr. BRITTEN. He does.

Mr. FRENCH. I want to answer the gentleman, and I am going to answer him; and I believe the House will feel we have answered the gentleman when we get through with this proposition. Of the British personnel afloat there are 61,808 men, and of the American personnel afloat there are 61,521.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is avoiding the question. I am talking about the total enlisted personnel in the British Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. I am coming to that.

Mr. BRITTEN. All right; let us go to it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. How many did the gentleman say the British had afloat?

Mr. FRENCH. I want to answer the gentleman's question first. The British then have an enlisted personnel afloat of 61,808.

Mr. BRITTEN. No.

Mr. FRENCH. Sixty-one thousand eight hundred and eight. The United States has an enlisted personnel afloat of 61,521, as of date only a few months ago.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is that counting the marines?

Mr. FRENCH. That does not count the marines; no.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, but the gentleman did count them just a little while ago.

Mr. FRENCH. No; I said they ought to be counted. Does not the gentleman think they ought to be counted to the extent of 2,500?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; because a marine is in no sense a seaman. The British marine is, but the American marine is not.

Mr. FRENCH. Does not the gentleman know—and I am sure he does know—that the American marine to-day to the extent of 2,500 or 2,600 are men who are manning guns, holding positions on naval ships that were it not for those men their places would need to be taken by enlisted men of the Navy? That is true not only in peace but it was true during the World War, and I can not conceive of a time when it would not be true were we to become involved in war.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me continue my answer, please.

Mr. LAZARO. Just for information.

Mr. FRENCH. In just a moment.

Now, what is the heart of the Navy? It is its capacity to function afloat, supported by the personnel ashore necessary to help it to function. I have shown you that the enlisted men of Great Britain afloat compare almost in the same notch with the enlisted personnel afloat of the United States, and to that number for the United States could well be added 2,500 marines and other groups to which I shall refer.

Now, part of the British personnel is made up of their provincials, the Australian Navy 4,669, the Canadian Navy 476—

Mr. BRITTEN. Is that 4,076 or 476?

Mr. FRENCH. Four hundred and seventy-six; the New Zealand division 533, the South African division 131, and the Royal Indian Marine 279.

Another factor that you must take into consideration in estimating ships' complements of men for essential ships is an examination of men of the two nations with respect to the services on types of ships. For instance, Great Britain maintains patrol boats and gunboats in far greater number than does the United States. Are they of any particular importance, will the gentleman say, from a naval-military standpoint?

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course they are.

Mr. FRENCH. Then let me call your attention to the fact—

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me first finish this statement. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] says they are, of course, of importance, and I say they are of some importance, but, on the other hand, they are not of the importance that the craft will be that are on the high seas and capable of going there. In other words, we are maintaining a few gunboats over in Asiatic waters, and I think the total is something like 9, as against 51 of similar type maintained by Great Britain and classified by the Navy Department in opposite columns. Valuable though these ships may be, after all they are not the ships that Great Britain would rely upon in event of war. But to man them there must be men. The gentleman does not believe that the men who are assigned to these ships are engaged in the same type of naval service as are most of the men of the British service and most of the men of our own Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman then is making the suggestion to the House that sailors and seamen aboard gunboats are not seamen; that they must be something else and should not be counted as seamen.

Mr. FRENCH. No; if the gentleman wants to make such a speech he can do so, but I am not making that statement.

Mr. BRITTEN. That, in substance, is what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. FRENCH. No; I have not said such a thing.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then tell us about the difference in the totals. Why should Great Britain have ten or eleven thousand more enlisted personnel in her navy than we have?

Mr. FRENCH. All right.



Mr. BRITTEN. You say all right, but you do not do it.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FRENCH. One minute. Let me pursue this question of my friend from Illinois a little further, and then I shall yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman said he was about to answer my question, but he has failed to do so.

Mr. PERKINS. In order that we may understand the matter, how many do you admit is the difference between the English personnel and our personnel?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman from New Jersey asked just what the actual difference is between the British and American personnel, and in answering the gentleman from Illinois I must also answer my friend from New Jersey. I am considering various factors that are not exactly alike in both navies.

We have in the British Navy an aviation force of 357 officers and 2,880 enlisted personnel. We have then a note made by our department that reads:

The royal air force supplies a large proportion of personnel for naval aviation. The only strictly naval personnel in the naval aviation service consists of 119 officers and 391 men, which are not included in item 7 but are carried in item 1. Six hundred and thirty-eight officers and 3,672 men are employed in United States naval aviation exclusive of those for general service in aircraft carriers, tenders, etc. The figures shown for the royal air force in item 7 are those attached to the coastal area headquarters for aircraft carriers, for flights abroad, etc. On August 31, 1925, the total strength of the royal air force was 3,448 officers, including 109 cadets, 29,797 airmen, and 8,763 civilians and natives. Of these totals, 2,425 officers, including 109 cadets, 21,900 airmen, and 3,439 civilians, were in home stations, such as air ministry, training stations, supply depots, manufacturing plants, etc., the duty performed being for both that portion of the air force detailed to fleet air arm and that portion serving in cooperation with the army and as a separate air force, a portion of this personnel should be considered in making a comparison.

It is contended that a large share of the aviation personnel of Great Britain should be charged to the navy, if a third, then upwards of 8,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman mean to convey the idea that the 8,000 personnel should be added or subtracted?

Mr. FRENCH. That this number should be added, and that then we should add a corresponding number to our Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman let me get this clearly. In the gentleman's figures 104,000 men and officers—how many do you include for aviation?

Mr. FRENCH. I include the figures furnished here 357 officers and 2,480 enlisted men.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then, how many officers and men are assigned to aviation in the American Navy?

Mr. FRENCH. Six hundred and thirty-eight officers and 3,672 men.

Mr. BRITTEN. When you say "officers and men," do you mean civilians attached to stations like Lakehurst?

Mr. FRENCH. No; I do not mean civilians. I do not include the civilians who may be employed in different places.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. These 8,000 civilians, so termed in this act, are they included as enlisted personnel of the British Navy?

Mr. FRENCH. No.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Do not they function as our enlisted men do in our Navy?

Mr. FRENCH. Possibly they do.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Then why should they not be included in the total; why should not you add the 8,000 men to the British forces?

Mr. FRENCH. They have not been included in the comparative figures furnished us for either navy.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. If the comparison is going to be made, why do not you include them; they are a part of the naval force; you call them civilians but they are enlisted men and they should be included in the total of the men employed in the navy?

Mr. FRENCH. In Great Britain, as you know, they have a united air service and there are certain officers and men assigned to the navy.

There are those who have urged, just as it is urged here, that because the officer and enlisted personnel in the aviation establishment is around 29,000 the share that should be charged to the Navy ought to be about one-third, and that that should be added to the sum total of the enlisted personnel of the British naval establishment and to ours as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time allotted by the gentleman to himself has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. I shall take another 20 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. In just a moment. Let us come to an end of this.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is only partially right.

Mr. FRENCH. Does the gentleman think a larger share ought to be added to the British personnel?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I think it should be a part of the navy.

Mr. FRENCH. Does the gentleman think we should match them officer for officer and man for man?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. Several gentlemen on the Republican side have been addressing the gentleman on the floor while seated in their seats. I think that is a bad practice, and I do not think it should be allowed.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. You say that the marines ought to be considered a part of the Navy. Then why not consider their aviation force which is assigned to the navy as a part of their navy? Why such a distinction?

Mr. FRENCH. To the extent that they are marines or aviators and are performing naval functions they should be considered a part of the officer and enlisted personnel of the institution. Instead of adding 18,000 marines to our Navy, I added 2,500, and why? We have 18,000 marines, but only 2,500 are performing naval functions or functions on ship-board that, were it not for the 2,500, would be performed by enlisted men of the Navy. We have then charged up in these columns a certain number of officers and enlisted personnel from the marines, and the statement has been made that we ought to add to that still further officers and men, to the extent of the British Navy's rightful proportion of the united air service. Does the gentleman think that we ought to match the British Air Service to that extent by adding officers and men to our own Navy? That is the point.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I do.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order, and I make the point of order along the same lines that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] made his, that in debate it is improper for the chairman of the subcommittee while on the floor to address any Member in the second person, as "You do so and so," or for a Member to address the gentleman occupying the floor in the same way. There is a proper method of procedure, and I make the point of order that the Chair ought to see that it is conducted properly.

The CHAIRMAN. If any gentleman feels that by lack of parliamentary practice he is in any way injured as to his dignity and the practice of the House, he will make that fact known to the Chair.

Mr. BRITTEN. And in the meantime will the Chair keep his eye on the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Does the Chair hold that that is proper in debate? I make the point of order that the third person should be used, and not the second.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. It is proper to say "the gentleman from Idaho" and "the gentleman from Illinois."

Mr. BRITTEN. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Texas is out of order.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman from Texas states the parliamentary rule in this House correctly.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly I do, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] has been bulldozing the gentleman from Idaho for the last half hour, but he can not bulldoze the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. In just a moment. I am going to yield now to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL] for a special purpose, which he has indicated to me.

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, while you are discussing the question of aviation, I have asked for this time to introduce to the House the youngest licensed pilot in America.

The young man to whom I refer is a resident of my home city, and his father and mother are both licensed pilots and are interested in the manufacture of airplanes.

This young man was given his license to fly on the 26th of August, 1925, and since being licensed has been in the air more than 300 hours. He has just completed a flight from Anderson to Washington, bringing to me a letter handed to him by the mayor of my home city. The young man arrived here last evening. His name is Farnam Parker and his age is 13 years.

I would like for the young man to stand in the gallery, so that the Members of the House may see the youngest licensed

pilot in America. It is needless for me to say I am mighty proud of this young man. [Great applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, now we must get back to the point where we were when these interruptions occurred. It has been suggested that we should add to the officer and enlisted personnel of the American Navy officers and men to match any such officers and men that ought to be chargeable to the British Navy for a similar function in connection with their service. I submit this ought to be the rule of the committee and of the Congress in shaping our appropriation bills. In the first place, we ought to have regard to similar types of services performed, but because it may be necessary for Great Britain to build up a tremendously large air service is not a reason why the United States should be required to build up such an institution here. The fact is that we ought to measure the Navy with their navy, the officer personnel and the enlisted personnel with their officer and enlisted personnel, and we ought not to be required to match men and officers that they feel necessary to maintain in the air service, which gentlemen say ought to be allocated in an arbitrary way, so many to the Navy and so many to the Army. I could turn, gentlemen, to the debates that occurred less than six months ago during the pendency of the naval program bill before the British Parliament and point out the British point of view on aviation, made necessary by the proximity of nations.

Speaking upon the shipbuilding program in the British House of Commons on July 29 last, Hon. Ramsay MacDonald, the former premier, said:

No one will say that America is a possible enemy. No one will say that Japan is a possible enemy. If anybody imagines that France is a possible enemy, then the problem, in view of modern development of arms, is not a naval problem at all; it is an air problem primarily, and in any event, to be a little more accurate, it is a problem of the coordination of the three forces.

The situation to which the former premier addressed himself had relation to potential enemy nations close at hand.

Have we any such situation as that? Why does it obtain in Great Britain and not here? Because we do not have potential enemies within the radius of effective military operation by means of airplanes.

If Great Britain finds it necessary to build up her air service in the way that she has done, and it is because of the fact that within a period of two hours planes from powerful countries could be within the heart of the British Empire, can there be any sound reason why we should adopt a policy of matching officers and men of Great Britain with officers and men when a corresponding peril does not exist?

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I will.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that has to do with the Navy. I think the House and the country are interested in knowing that the gentleman's subcommittee is for a 5-5-3 Navy or not.

Mr. FRENCH. Does that complete the question?

Mr. LAZARO. No.

Mr. FRENCH. Go ahead and ask your question, as I want to discuss it rather fully.

Mr. LAZARO. If the gentleman is for the 5-5-3 Navy, I would like to know what has been done relative to these six battleships that were lacking in gun range and were coal burners?

Mr. FRENCH. I propose to withhold an answer to that question until I make just a few further observations in the matter of officers and enlisted personnel, and then I shall come to the question which the gentleman proposes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I am not through with the question. Gentlemen keep asking me questions and do not allow me sufficient time to answer them.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. BACON. I understood the chairman to say there were about 4,000 civilian seamen in the British Navy who were deducted from the British totals who are used on transports and cargo vessels.

Mr. FRENCH. They are so listed here; yes.

Mr. BACON. Why should not those 4,000 be included in the British Navy total?

Mr. FRENCH. Is that the gentleman's question?

Mr. BACON. The reason I desired to ask that is because I wanted to find out how many enlisted seamen of our Navy are to-day on transports and cargo vessels. Those are the two questions.

Mr. FRENCH. I said that some 4,000 civilians were classified with the enlisted personnel of the British Navy in bringing

up their totals. I say also that it is hardly fair to include that number in the sum of the British totals because of the fact that we are doing in large part a comparable service through employing civilian agencies, not naval agencies, in doing the same work.

Mr. BACON. But do not we use enlisted men on cargo vessels and transports?

Mr. FRENCH. We do.

Mr. BACON. What is the total number?

Mr. FRENCH. We have a limited number, approximately 2,100.

Mr. BACON. Therefore, if we deduct 4,000 from the British total, why is it not proper to deduct 2,100 from the American total?

Mr. FRENCH. For the reason that Great Britain has even more than 2,100 of the same kind that really belong to their navy, naval officers and enlisted men. I do not ask you to deduct them and do not ask you to deduct our 2,100. Let me state this further thought: We have to-day a Coast Guard that in the event of war would be a part of the Navy.

Gentlemen of the committee should remember that the last Congress provided that about 19 or 20 destroyers be turned over to the Coast Guard. These destroyers are officered and manned. These destroyers to-day have a complement aggregating something like 1,820 men. Not only that, but we had a number of craft belonging to the Coast Guard that, together with the ones to which I have referred, have a total of officers and enlisted men complement approaching 9,680. In other words, there are many factors that must be taken into consideration in making comparison between the British Navy and our Navy in enlisted and officer personnel. In the event of war, the officers and men of the Coast Guard would be called into the Naval Establishment.

Mr. BRITTEN. Would not the gentleman suggest to the House that the figures compiled and presented by the Navy Department, showing approximately 94,000 enlisted personnel in the British Navy and 83,000, approximately, in the American Navy are correct?

Mr. FRENCH. I assume that they are correct for the purpose for which they are prepared; but I also have the right, in connection with that, to have the gentleman know and keep in his mind constantly the fact that the comparison for essential purposes is almost exactly alike for officers and men in these two great establishments.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman continues to say in reply to my question something that may be accurate and true, but which is debatable nevertheless. Take the 82,000 men that we are appropriating for now. You say that because three ships are laid up temporarily that would make a logical deduction of 2,700 men. That brings it down to 79,300. You are appropriating for 82,000. By what process do you make that deduction of 1,300 men when the department has estimated for 82,000?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I will withhold my answer for a moment, just as in the case of the question propounded by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO], because I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has a question about aviation. Suppose, first, we consider the question propounded by the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BRITTEN. They are not comparable questions at all. There is nothing comparable between them.

Mr. FRENCH. The first part of the question of the gentleman from Louisiana involves the question that I think the gentleman from Illinois intended to ask, and the second part refers to the modification of the ships. Now with regard to the 5-5-3 ratio and the question which the gentleman raises touching the enlisted personnel, I beg to say this: The committee believes, and I believe, that we ought to maintain the 5-5-3 ratio, having in mind what other nations are doing in the same connection. I have already called attention to the fact that Great Britain has placed out of full commission five of her battleships and two of her battle cruisers. I have pointed out that she is maintaining 54 destroyers in active commission as against 103 destroyers maintained by the United States. I have pointed out that Great Britain is maintaining scarcely more than one-half the number of submarines maintained by the United States. Yet Great Britain is one of the 5-5-3 parties in the treaty arrangement.

Does the gentleman challenge Great Britain in not maintaining those ships? Does the gentleman say that notwithstanding the fact that Great Britain is working economies by putting those craft out of commission we ought not to have some regard for what Great Britain is doing along the same line?

Mr. BRITTEN. I think Great Britain is maintaining the 5-5-3 ratio, and that is demonstrable when she has 95,000 enlisted personnel as against our 82,000.



Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Is it not a fact that Great Britain has just as many men afloat as the United States and has some 10,000 more men ashore than the United States Navy?

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman means the enlisted personnel?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. All her personnel. She has something like 85,000 afloat and 10,000 ashore.

Mr. FRENCH. I have already said that as to the number afloat the figures are practically the same, and as to the number ashore we are doing things either through the Coast Guard or through the marines or through the civilian personnel that bring us up to comparable figure with Great Britain there.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is not seriously including the Coast Guard as a part of the American Navy, is he?

Mr. FRENCH. Most assuredly. The Coast Guard personnel is doing a work that has as much naval or military value as much of the service which the gentleman includes in the British navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is there an officer in the Coast Guard who is a graduate of the Naval Academy?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then why does the gentleman compare them and say that their work is the same?

Mr. FRENCH. I say their work is very comparable to the types of work of officers and men in the British service that the gentleman insists on including in their navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman mean that the activities of rum-runners are on a par with military duty?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman knows, as I do, that the questions involved in steaming and navigation, with officers trained in those arts, would tend to make them superior as officers and men.

Mr. BRITTEN. That applies entirely to the merchant marine?

Mr. FRENCH. True.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then if you include our merchant marine you would have a vast excess over what Great Britain has.

Mr. FRENCH. My only difference with the gentleman from Illinois is this: He wants to include certain civilians when it suits his purpose with the naval establishment of Great Britain, and to exclude more effective persons when applied to the United States. That is all there is to it. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman was going to answer this question: How did he make his deduction of 1,300 men in the appropriation that is now carried in the bill before the House?

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman will not take all my time I will answer his question. In the first place, the statement the gentleman has made is incorrect. We did not make a deduction of 1,300; we deducted 1,000 men from the Budget estimates, the Budget estimates being 83,000, and the estimates we bring in are for 82,000.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I do not believe the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] wanted to leave the impression that all the United States Coast Guard Service has done is to go after rum-runners. Is it not a fact that in a great many respects they have a more hazardous occupation than the United States Navy has, and is it not a fact that during the war they joined hands with the Navy and rendered valuable service to our country?

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, the gentleman has made a correct statement. Now I will answer the question asked by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO], as to what we think of the 5-5-3 ratio. I have answered the question referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] and I have answered as to the personnel.

We believe in maintaining the 5-5-3 ratio, having regard to what other nations are doing looking to its maintenance. The 5-5-3 ratio has relation to several essential things, one being battleships. We are maintaining as many battleships, or have been until three were placed under overhaul, as we were entitled to maintain under the treaty.

Mr. LAZARO. But the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. FRENCH. Just wait a minute. We have to-day three battleships undergoing major overhaul for the purpose of accomplishing the things to which the gentleman directed his question. As soon as these three shall be withdrawn from the yards their places will be taken by three others; and

shortly after the end of the fiscal year 1927, under the moneys we are carrying in the bill and that were appropriated a year ago, we shall have completed practically the entire work of overhaul, to which the gentleman refers. Then the question arises, Shall we maintain 18 battleships if Great Britain is maintaining but 15, and shall we be accused, if we drop down one or two with Great Britain maintaining but 15, of not keeping up to the ratio? Shall we be accused of that if Great Britain is maintaining a less rigid policy as to battleships?

Mr. LAZARO. I will say this to the gentleman, I am not in favor of having more battleships than Great Britain.

Mr. FRENCH. In commission.

Mr. LAZARO. But those we have ought to be up-to-date, and I am certainly not in favor of having coal-burners as against oil-burners and battleships that lack range.

Mr. FRENCH. Then the gentleman ought to be satisfied. Of course, the question of range was not considered in the bill which the Congress passed last year. As regards the coal-burner situation, it was considered, and the overhaul is proceeding along the economical lines recommended by the Budget, and we propose no reduction whatever in the bill.

Mr. LAZARO. How do we compare with Great Britain when it comes to airplane carriers?

Mr. FRENCH. As to airplane carriers, Great Britain has two completed of the first line, with a tonnage of 41,890, and she has two of the second line with a tonnage of 25,400, a total of 67,290. The United States has completed the *Langley*, with a tonnage of 12,700, and under construction the *Saratoga* and *Lexington*, with a total tonnage of 66,000, or a total when completed within a year of 78,700. In other words, in a year from now we will be superior to Great Britain from the standpoint of airplane carriers, and the limit as to both Great Britain and the United States is 135,000 tons.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The gentleman keeps using the word "economy." I suppose the gentleman's argument is based on the principle of saving, and I presume that is the reason the gentleman is holding the number down to 82,000 enlisted men. Is that the idea of the gentleman?

Mr. FRENCH. Does that complete the question?

Mr. ALLGOOD. No. I want to know, then, if the gentleman will give us the comparative cost of maintaining the Navy of the United States and the Navy of Great Britain; that is, the officers' salaries and the salaries of the seamen. I would like to have the gentleman give us the comparative cost. I judge the gentleman wants to get down to the basic facts as to whether or not we are maintaining an economical Navy, so I think we ought to have a comparison between the United States and Great Britain. That would be a point of interest, if the gentleman has that information.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman has forgotten the first premise I laid down. We had in mind several factors, one is economy as the gentleman suggests, another is the ratio, another is regard for the national defense, and I might say also the working out of the interpretation of the ratio by other countries. So much then for the gentleman's first question.

With regard to the comparison of the two navies as to cost, they are approximately the same. Great Britain's 1924-25 budget was \$56,505,216, or \$274,695,000. The year before the British budget was somewhat larger. I am not able to give the exact figures touching salaries paid to officers and to men, and I assume the gentleman does not care as to that.

Let me now continue further with regard to the program that the committee has recommended.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question right there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. In order to follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO] a few moments ago, I would like to ask this question. The chairman of the committee very wisely said that as a matter of economy Great Britain is reducing the number of ships she is keeping on the seas, and we should do likewise in order to comply with the 5-5-3 ratio, and I am wondering if Great Britain should run down to 12 ships, just as Japan has now and is authorized under the treaty, would the gentleman be in favor of reducing our ships afloat or in active commission to 12 rather than 18?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, the gentleman takes one factor into account. That problem the committee would need to meet when we saw what the situation was with regard to Japan, with regard to France and to Italy. I hope as the result of another limitation of armament conference we may reduce the battleships required even to the point the gentleman suggests. [Applause.]



Mr. BRITTEN. That is all right and that is quite true, but does the gentleman suggest to the House that because of economies in England we should come down to the Japanese ratio?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, I have not suggested that.

Mr. BRITTEN. You are going along that line.

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no; I have not even started along that line. The point I have in mind is that to the extent Great Britain has already found it desirable to work economies within the 5-5-3 program, if we can see that the military defenses of our country are such that it will be permitted, we ought to approach it and make it easier for Great Britain to progress.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will yield once more, do I understand then that notwithstanding the recommendation of the Budget officer or of the Navy Department with its expert personnel, the Committee on Appropriations has arbitrarily appropriated for 1,000 less men than the Navy Department desires and wants and really needs; is that right?

Mr. FRENCH. No; the gentleman will apply whatever designation he pleases to what I say regardless of what I wish him to do. I have already indicated the reasons for our proposed reduction and I have indicated that it is premised upon reductions that we believe we can make and that we ought to make, having in mind what the other nation that is on a parity with ourselves under the treaty is doing and proposes to do. I could have gone further a bit ago and could have said that for the coming year the British Admiralty is proposing a reduction of still further magnitude by withdrawing 15 additional destroyers out of active commission.

Now, how is this going to be reflected in the expenses of the Navy? In the first place, it is reflected to the extent of one-half million dollars for every 1,000 enlisted personnel of the lowest grade in the Navy, and from that up to \$700,000 or \$800,000 for the higher grades.

But one can not mention the addition of new ships or the retaining of any of our ships within the Naval Establishment without considering other large elements besides enlisted personnel. The two aircraft carriers will add to engineering expenses. They will add to expenses of construction and repair. They will add to ordnance. They will add to expense of transportation. Are you going to ignore the immense amount of money we are appropriating for all of these elements for the Naval Establishment as it is to-day and say that if these carriers shall come in we do not propose to withdraw any one of any type from the Naval Establishment? Does it mean that we are beginning a program under which additional men and additional money will be added for the upkeep of these additions to the Navy without regard to the heavy burdens that the Naval Establishment is exacting of us to-day? The coming year (1927) will witness the addition to our fleet of new ships. They are not of a replacement type, aside from the gunboats. The building program, to which I directed your attention a bit ago, and that in part at least we must expect to meet, will add additional ships, new ships, to the Naval Establishment within the next five years. Do you propose, if you add these ships, and many of them will not be in the nature of replacement ships—do you propose, I say, to keep all the ships of the Naval Establishment that are to-day afloat, that are to-day in commission, in commission as these new craft may be added, and thereby pile your naval appropriation bill moneys higher and higher instead of maintaining them at a constant level? Your committee believes that we must protect the Treasury of the United States from the enormous expenditures that such naval expansion will mean if we are to have regard for the burdens that rest upon the people of this country. For that reason, then, your committee recommends that for the coming fiscal year we effect certain reductions.

#### PROPOSED REDUCTIONS

These reductions will be attained by withdrawing a very limited number of ships of the establishment as it is to-day out of active commission. When Great Britain takes one of her great ships out of active commission and places it in reserve it is my understanding that she places on board only 10 per cent of the personnel that would be necessary were the ship in full commission. There can be no reason why the United States might not follow the same example. Your committee has not sought to indicate what ships or what types of ships should be withdrawn. May I say that the withdrawal of a battleship would relieve 1,200 men. The withdrawal of a cruiser would relieve 300 men. The withdrawal of a destroyer would relieve 100 men. There can be modifications made in the program of withdrawals. The withdrawals need not all be from battleships or cruisers or destroyers or submarines. They might be from a single type, they might be

some chosen from each type. This is a matter of administration and it is a matter that can be worked out by the department. With that then in view, your committee comes to you with a report that will mean the maintenance of your fleet in essentially the condition that it is to-day, that will provide for manning and caring for the additions in the way of new craft that will be added to the Naval Establishment during 1927, and that will effect economies in the following particulars:

Transportation and recruiting	\$106,000
Engineering	770,000
Construction and repair	320,000
Pay for the Navy	386,500
Provisions, Navy	186,000

Or a total in these items of..... 1,768,500

#### FUEL AND TRANSPORTATION

But there are two other major factors in the program that the committee recommends. Of these two the first one to which I shall refer is fuel and transportation. By withdrawing a limited number of ships from the Naval Establishment that would have regard for about 2,000 enlisted men, we can reduce in sizeable dimensions the item for fuel and transportation.

The Budget estimates for 1927 for fuel and transportation are in the figures \$14,750,000. Those figures were based upon the list of ships to which I referred a few moments ago and a fairly definite amount of steaming for each type of ship. The plans for steaming for 1927 include as the major factor the fleet maneuvers for the year. The project as it now appears will be for the maneuvers to occur essentially off Guantanamo and off the Atlantic coast. The major part of our ships at the beginning of the cruise and maneuvers will be on the Pacific coast. Enormous steaming will be required to carry out the complete program and to do all the other steaming that will be necessary during the year upon the part of different types. For battleships it is estimated that the steaming for 12 of the ships will be 21,500 miles. Six of them will be in commission only part of the year, and their miles of steaming will be 7,000 as to three and 13,500 as to the other three. It is planned that 10 of our light cruisers will steam more than 20,600 miles each; that certain other cruisers will steam from 16,200 to as much as 25,500 miles each; that each of 103 destroyers will steam more than 19,000 miles; that each of 77 submarines will steam 10,000 miles; and that each of our four fleet submarines will steam 21,500 miles. I am not mentioning the steaming provided for other craft. Some of the auxiliary ships, such as colliers and transports, must steam far more than the mileage I have indicated for a ship of a single type. The question addressed itself to the committee whether or not this steaming was not in excess of that which was essential.

Manifestly a certain amount of steaming is essential for keeping ships in best condition, for keeping the men trained, for keeping the command advised and trained in the great problems of maneuvering and handling craft essential in the event of war. On the other hand, there comes a line beyond which by the very process of using the craft we are subtracting from their value by wear and tear. This is reflected in engineering. It is reflected in construction and repair. During the last several years extra costs have been piling up under engineering, especially coinciding with a more liberal policy touching the steaming of ships. I have no doubt these two factors have immediate relation and that in part the cause of the necessity for increased cost for repair is by reason of more steaming than ought to be.

#### STEAMING PROGRAM OF GREAT BRITAIN

It appeared to members of the committee that when it came to steaming, we were following a program far more liberal than that seen necessary by any other nation. Great Britain again seemed to be the nation with which comparison could be made, and we were led to believe that our steaming was vastly beyond the steaming required in the British fleet. Notwithstanding the fact that the British Empire extends all over the world, notwithstanding the fact that there must be added to the cost of steaming in the British Empire vast sums to care for coming into contact with the various parts of the empire, notwithstanding such things as this, it seemed that we were following a program of steaming far in excess of that which Great Britain believes necessary. Officers of our Navy before the committee did not believe that we were in excess by 50 per cent. I pressed further, and while no accurate figures could be given touching the steaming of Great Britain, I believe that our steaming can not be far from 30 per cent in excess of the steaming required by the British fleet. I think that our officers feel that this figure can not be far wrong and that they would not be willing to make a positive statement



that our steaming is not more than that, and, on the other hand, that it is not less. We feel that the item for fuel and transportation could not be justified to the extent of the excessive steaming to which I have referred.

#### EAST AND WEST COAST PURCHASES

Again, on the basis of Budget estimates it was anticipated that one-third of the fuel oil would be purchased on the Pacific coast and two-thirds on the Atlantic. Upon consideration of the factors to which I have just referred, namely, the withdrawal of a very limited number of ships from active commission and the cutting down in some degree of the amount of steaming, we feel that we could and that we ought to take from the item fuel and transportation the amount of \$1,750,000. In other words, to report to you an item for fuel and transportation of \$13,000,000 for the fiscal year 1927. I believe that this will provide steaming on a somewhat reduced scale, but that will permit carrying out the essential maneuvers for 1927, and I believe that it will provide for a program that is considerably larger than Great Britain would regard as adequate for her navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman has just said that the deduction of \$1,711,000 was made in fuel appropriations. Was that deduction made with the advice and guidance of the experts of the Navy Department, the General Board? Did the committee arbitrarily deduct \$1,700,000? I am asking for information.

Mr. FRENCH. Does the gentleman think that the officers of the Navy Department would advise us to take any ships out of commission?

Mr. BRITTEN. My question was whether the committee arbitrarily deducted \$1,700,000, or did they do so on the recommendation of the experts of the Navy or the Budget officer?

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman knows that the Navy Department officers would not advise us to take any ships out of commission.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman want me to answer the question?

Mr. FRENCH. My friend from Illinois likes to answer questions when the answer will support his side of the question. He knows the answer to the question he asked me just as well as if I would answer it. Of course the officers of the Navy Department have not come and begged us to take ships out of commission.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I have indicated my willingness to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; the gentleman has been very kind. I have asked him no questions about taking ships out of commission. For the enlightenment of the House I want to know by what authority the committee made a reduction of \$1,700,000 in the appropriation for fuel. The gentleman talks about ships. I am not talking about ships.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman forgets that fuel has relation to ships. [Laughter.] The only purpose of carrying an appropriation for fuel at all would be to maintain the ships in motion. The department through its officers did not recommend a reduction of ships, nor the estimates in the Budget, nor the reduction of steaming mileage, nor has the department recommended or advised that we purchase oil on the Pacific side instead of on the Atlantic to the extent proposed by the committee. But these three propositions will appeal to the sensible Members of this House. Specialists in the Navy as everywhere are interested in their own line, and we must take into consideration the good of the whole country and not necessarily take the advice of any branch of the Navy in which the experts may be interested. [Applause.]

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Does not the gentleman think that we ought to keep the 5-3 ratio with Japan as we do the 5-5 ratio with Great Britain?

Mr. FRENCH. That question has had the consideration of our committee.

We believe we are substantially carrying out the program of the ratio with respect to Japan. It is true that as to the different types of ships we do not have at all times the ratio in all ships that might be suggested by the treaty, either as to Japan, Great Britain, or any other nation. In one place one nation bulges out stronger than another. In another place that same nation will be weaker than another. To-day there is an unusual condition existing in Japan. To-day Japan has a rather large enlisted personnel. But there are reasons that exist for a liberal personnel program on the part of Japan that do not involve the United States. What is the situation? Suppose there were adjacent to the United States countries

that were involved in war. Suppose Mexico, the Central American countries, South America, were all aflame, does anyone think, then, that we would fail to maintain rather a large enlisted personnel? We possibly would be putting into full commission destroyers and submarines that are now in decommissioned status, not with a view to hostility, but for the purpose of protecting ourselves against any eventuality. So it is with Japan to-day. Fire is running through China. It can not help but involve Japanese interests. Russia is interested. Japan must be interested, and being interested must keep a large personnel on her ships to watch and care for the situation.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The gentleman will admit, however, that we have not the 5-5-3 ratio between the United States and Japan.

Mr. FRENCH. I did not say that; nor is it true.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Japan has a greater ratio than we.

Mr. FRENCH. No; that is not correct. What I said was that Japan to-day has possibly a slightly larger number of enlisted personnel in proportion to the ratio than have we, but the ratio does not refer to enlisted personnel. The ratio refers to battleships and carriers and tonnage and to sizes of guns.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that while Japan has six battleships under the treaty she has only five in commission, and that while she has four battle cruisers under the treaty she has only three in commission?

Mr. FRENCH. I think the gentleman gives the figures accurately.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Does the gentleman mean to say to the House that because the personnel is not involved in the 5-5-3 treaty, an unmanned ship can meet a fully manned ship?

Mr. FRENCH. I have not undertaken to say that at all, but I have said in substance that there are a good many elements that enter into the picture. There are a good many factors that must be considered. One of them is men and one is ships, and you can subdivide that as to types of ships, and I do say that substantially the United States is maintaining her rightful place under the treaty.

Mr. LAZARO. But the gentleman has just made the statement that Japan has a larger personnel than we have.

Mr. FRENCH. No; I have not made that statement.

Mr. LAZARO. That is what I understood.

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman so understood, he understood incorrectly. I will give the figures furnished to us. The United States has an enlisted personnel of 81,702 as of September 30, plus 2,500 marines, who are doing the duty that would be done by enlisted men in the Navy were it not for the marines, and in addition to that we have all those other indefinite numbers of men to which I have referred.

Japan has 65,402 enlisted men. She maintains from 60 to 62 per cent of her enlisted men afloat. That means that she has afloat from 39,242 to 40,550 men on her ships, as against more than 61,522 men afloat maintained by the United States.

Mr. LAZARO. Did not the gentleman say awhile ago that on account of the trouble in China and Russia, Japan had a little larger personnel than we?

Mr. FRENCH. No. What I did say was this, that as to men she has a relatively larger figure than the ships' ratio.

Mr. LAZARO. One more question. Are our ships fully manned?

Mr. FRENCH. Of course they are not. No navy ought to keep its ships fully manned in peace times.

Mr. LAZARO. Are they as well manned as the British ships in personnel?

Mr. FRENCH. It has always been thought that the United States mans her ships more strongly than Great Britain—that is, personnel in the essential ships.

Mr. LAZARO. Then, why has Great Britain a larger personnel than the United States?

Mr. FRENCH. I have already indicated that by pointing out the number of types of ships that Great Britain has that are performing functions that I do not think are of an essential military value, as are the functions performed by battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and ships of that sort.

Mr. LAZARO. And the gentleman includes marines and the Coast Guard?

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. HADLEY. The gentleman prefaced this colloquy with a statement with reference to the treaty ratio strength as to Japan, and he stated in his opening statement that the program reported out by the committee is substantially in conformity to the treaty ratio. In this colloquy which has recently occurred he states that the enlisted personnel does not go to the question of the ratio strength at all.

Mr. FRENCH. I did not make that statement.

Mr. HADLEY. That was the inference drawn from the statement the gentleman made.

Mr. FRENCH. It was not the inference that should have been drawn from the statement.

Mr. HADLEY. Very well. The gentleman has opened this question not in a full way at all, and I think, in view of the questions which have been asked and answered, the gentleman owes it to the House to put in the RECORD, either now or later, for the information of the House, a definite and detailed statement that will give the House the information as to what the committee has done in reference to the treaty ratio strength as to Japan, and full particulars be given, so that no inference will be necessary to be drawn and we will have the facts. I think the House should have that information.

Mr. FRENCH. Let me make this observation in answer to the suggestion of my friend from Washington [Mr. HADLEY].

The statement I made with reference to the question of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO] as to men could have been to the effect that one of the factors that must be taken into account is men, but, even so, a factor that is not even mentioned in the treaty touching ratios. The gentleman knows that the treaty refers to 18 battleships for the United States, 18 for Great Britain—

Mr. BRITTEN. No; 22.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; 18 battleships, some of which are old, and 4 battle cruisers to make up for her inferior ships. Japan has 6 battleships and 4 battle cruisers. The treaty refers to tonnage total of 525,000 for battleships of the United States and three-fifths of that for Japan. It refers to airplane-carrier strength of 135,000 for the United States and Great Britain each and three-fifths of that for Japan. Outside of that, there is nothing in regard to ratio in the treaty. We may build as many cruisers as we desire; we may build any other ships we desire. We would be limited as to tonnage on all ships, and we would be limited as to size of guns. There are certain factors of that kind in the treaty, but nothing as regards the number of men.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. No; let me go on further. Now, as we have presented in this bill, we have felt that there is something even more than that we ought constantly to have in mind, and that is the spirit of the treaty. That is a factor that does involve men; it does involve ships of auxiliary types; and it does involve resources; it does involve a great many elements not recognized in the treaty itself. All of these factors your committee has endeavored to consider.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. FRENCH. I want to bring this discussion to an end.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I sought recognition to ask a question, and the gentleman declined to yield then, and I ask him to yield now.

Mr. FRENCH. For a further question?

Mr. HADLEY. The House is thoroughly familiar with all the treaty provided, I think. The gentleman, instead of answering the question I asked, proceeded to tell the House the provisions of the treaty. What I am asking about is the provisions of the bill with respect to its relation to treaty requirements and particularly in reference to the ratio between the United States and Japan.

Mr. FRENCH. Well—

Mr. HADLEY. The gentleman has not answered that question and not purported to answer it, except by the statement that he has just made when he proceeded to analyze the provisions of the treaty.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman ought to bear this in mind: That when we report a bill we do not report it in the terms of a treaty. Now, under the bill we have reported the Navy Department can maintain all our treaty battleships in full commission and all the airplane carriers, including the two that will come into commission within a year. The department can make some deduction in other ships of the Navy if it chooses to do so. In other words, as to every essential part or factor that should be considered, whether within the treaty or outside of it, the bill carries funds that will enable our Government to maintain its part within ratio.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. FRENCH. All right.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman give me any information as to just how the Navy promotes the officer personnel? And do they demote some of them? For instance, if they have a thousand officers and the appropriation provided for only 800, how do they make the reduction? Do they take a commissioned officer and put him back to the position of a non-commissioned officer?

The CHAIRMAN. The time referred to by the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. I want to consume 15 minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

Now, let me make this statement: The gentleman's problem is taken care of in the law itself. The number of officers is based upon a certain percentage, defined in the law, of the authorized enlisted men strength. These are line officers and include a ratio from admiral down to ensign. Staff officers, such as the Medical Corps and the Dental Corps and others of that type, are added in defined ratio. In fact, the department could not keep a larger percentage of officers than is defined by the law itself.

Mr. SCHAFER. What I want to get at is this: Say we have a certain number of graduates of the Naval Academy, and we reduce the number of the officer personnel. What do you do with the graduates? Do you make them noncommissioned officers?

Mr. FRENCH. We do not have the maximum in officer strength at present that we are entitled to under the law. At the present time we take care of the graduates of the Naval Academy by having them enter the Navy. To-day we are short about 700 officers. It will be at least two years before we shall be up to the authorized strength of officers in the Navy. Should there be a surplus of graduates, commissions would be refused to the extent of the excess number.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. I am compelled to deduce from the gentleman's statement that he has no navy yards in his district, and that he has neither a son nor a nephew nor a brother in the Navy. [Laughter.] The graduates from the Naval Academy constitute the basis for the officers of the line?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. A man who is a graduate of a civilian college who wishes to serve his country's Navy can not rise to be an officer in the Navy because some Member of Congress will not give him an appointment to the Naval Academy. He can not break through the crust of the officers' class even by hard work and study and loyalty?

Mr. FRENCH. In the Navy a different policy is maintained from that pursued in the Army. In the Army more than one-half of the officer strength comes from colleges, universities, technical schools, military schools, and other similar institutions.

In the Navy the policy is different because of the technical work having to do with the ships and with the Naval Establishment generally. In other words, the Navy is eventually fed through the academy in the matter of line officers. In the Army we expand by taking many officers from civil life.

Mr. McSWAIN. The gentleman acknowledges that that very technical work he is talking about is done by the warrant officers in the Navy themselves?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BRITTEN. Every year as many as 100 boys can come out of the service itself without appointment by Members of Congress and go directly to the academy. They go through the academy without appointment by Members of Congress, do they not?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. In a moment. We may admit 100 from the enlisted personnel in addition to 25 from the Naval Reserve and the number named by the President and those maintained at the academy at all times by Senators and Representatives.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman mean to deny that the opportunity is shut off from the enlisted men of getting commissions? I know of some of the best men in the service have come from the enlisted ranks and never entered the academy.

Mr. FRENCH. But only, I am sure my friend will agree, under special or war legislation.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.



Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman explain what he is going to do about replacing the *Shenandoah*, and what he will do about the *Los Angeles*, and what we will do about the station at Lakehurst, the only one of its kind in the country?

Mr. FRENCH. I was just reaching that question.

## LAKEHURST

Lakehurst is the lighter-than-air station of our Government, and that was built at a cost of more than \$6,000,000. When we had the *Shenandoah* she was cared for at Lakehurst, and, aside from the expenditures for helium, it required approximately \$1,715,000 to maintain the institution. The *Shenandoah* was in every sense a Navy ship. There was no limit as to its use. It was as much a ship of the Navy, so far as use was concerned for peace time or for war, as was a battleship or a cruiser. The *Los Angeles* under the treaty was turned over to the United States, but it was turned over to the United States under limitations that denied us the use of the ship for any military purpose. It could be cared for at Lakehurst alongside of the *Shenandoah* by practically the same officers and men, by essentially the same cost for heat and light and overhead—in other words, as a sort of by-product, by an expenditure of \$130,000 a year. Now, when we were expending \$1,715,000 for the maintenance of the *Shenandoah*, and when by the expenditure of an amount less than 10 per cent as large, we could care for a sister ship, even though she was not usable for military purposes or the defense of our country, we were ready to add our approval of the program. But with the destruction of the *Shenandoah* the equation has changed.

To maintain the *Los Angeles* will require approximately the same amount of money as was necessary for the maintenance of the *Shenandoah*. It would require \$1,716,500 to maintain Lakehurst and care for the *Los Angeles* for 1927, and this exclusive of any expenditures for helium. The members of your committee were challenged by such a program. Would we have been justified in bringing in an item in so large a sum that would accomplish so little as that which could be accomplished by maintaining the *Los Angeles* in commission? What had we to gain? We were told that from experiments made, test flights, and programs that had been undertaken by both the *Shenandoah* and the *Los Angeles*, that neither type of ship would justify itself from a commercial standpoint. Barring accident, either type of ship could make the trip across the seas or to Bermuda or across the country. We were told that it would be desirable to see whether or not a ship of this type could maintain a regular route. But why expend such a vast amount of money for such a purpose? We were not proposing, and it was not proposed, that we maintain a definite route. I think we may accept it as certain that, barring accidents and barring unfortunate weather conditions of the severest type, that a ship such as either the *Los Angeles* or the *Shenandoah* could maintain definite service. It was argued that we ought to look forward to the time when we would have a ship of five or six million cubic feet. We were told that such a ship would be profitable commercially across the Atlantic, but further experience with the *Los Angeles* would prove little in the matter of a ship two and a half times as large. But we were told that we should maintain the *Los Angeles* for the training of officers and men. But to what end? No such ship has yet been authorized by Congress. Your committee did not have authority to make appropriation for so much as the beginning of such a ship.

With these thoughts in view your committee has recommended that Lakehurst be maintained in a closed-down condition. We have recommended an appropriation of \$125,000 for the care of the great plant and the care of the *Los Angeles*; her machinery and her fabric must receive attention. We believe the amount we have recommended will be adequate for the purpose, and it is in the terms of the figures submitted by the Bureau of Aeronautics. By maintaining Lakehurst in a closed-down condition we shall be able to release more than 200 men for the Navy and more than 200 marines, who will take their places elsewhere in the naval or marine service.

Mr. APPLEBY. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: The bill for the construction of the new *Shenandoah* is before the Naval Affairs Committee, so would it not be better to wait until the Naval Affairs Committee has decided whether or not they are going to build another *Shenandoah* before you determine what you are going to do with Lakehurst?

Mr. FRENCH. It is always the policy of the committee to wait for an authorization before it makes appropriations for such purposes as that, and we would need to do that here.

Mr. BUTLER. Why did you not wait? When did your waiting begin, my friend? You have not waited in this bill, because you have authorized the construction of a ship in connection with commerce. You have provided for an appro-

priation of \$300,000, against which we shall have to take some exception.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does the gentleman mean that the \$1,700,000 includes the pay of the officers and men?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. That pay will go on just the same?

Mr. FRENCH. That part as to pay of the men will go on, and it is in part because of the men we could find at Lakehurst that we were able to make a deduction of 1,000 men in the estimates that we have brought forward.

Mr. PATTERSON. About 400.

Mr. FRENCH. That would include the marines. A little over 200 would be the number for the Navy.

Mr. ARENTZ. Was anything brought out in the hearings regarding the commercial investigation of helium in addition to that carried on by the Government?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me answer the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], the chairman of the legislative committee. I said the Appropriations Committee did not have the authority to appropriate for a ship, but it does have authority to make appropriations for experimental purposes. We have carried appropriations aggregating \$1,900,000 for continued experimental purposes in aviation. Of this amount \$1,600,000, plus, is for heavier-than-air craft and \$300,000 is for lighter-than-air experimentation. That is within the discretionary authority of the Navy Department. The item to which my friend refers did not come to us through the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget, but it does have reference to an experiment—if the department desires to carry it on—looking to the development of a metal type of lighter-than-air craft.

Mr. BUTLER. What induced this? Did the military men recommend it? The fact is that they have all come to us and said they protested against it.

Mr. FRENCH. It would not be fair to state to the House that the recommendation for the duralumin type of metal airship has the support or recommendation of the department nor did it come to us through the Bureau of the Budget. But on the other hand, the proposition is not new. It has been before several of the departments for a good many months and it was finally brought to our committee. The committee held hearings upon it.

Mr. BUTLER. My friend, it was brought to you by a business institution in the United States, which is endeavoring to build this kind of an airship, and we are going to put \$300,000 of Government money into it.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me just finish this.

Mr. BEGG. My question has to do with that proposition and the statement the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just made.

Mr. FRENCH. Let me finish answering the question. This proposition, I would say, has been a subject of investigation by the Aircraft Corporation, of Detroit, Mich. That concern has spent thousands of dollars on investigational work, and the proposition was made to the department that that concern would spend more money than the department would be asked to spend on a joint experiment, and after the hearings we had it was decided that it would be a desirable investigation to carry on.

We are to-day carrying \$1,600,000 for experimental work where the Government assumes all the responsibility of experimentation in heavier-than-air aircraft. Here was \$300,000 that we appropriated to match, dollar for dollar, an experiment that seemed worth while to make, where the other fellow was willing to more than match the dollar of Uncle Sam. Even at that, it is up to the sound discretion of the Navy Department, and the department does not need to make the investigation if it does not feel it is a desirable thing to do. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEGG. I am not interested in the controversy between the various branches of the Navy. The thing that struck me pretty forcefully was what I understood the gentleman to say in his remarks when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] first introduced the subject of the \$300,000 appropriation unauthorized.

I understood the gentleman to say that, of course, the Committee on Appropriations could not appropriate for an unauthorized ship but did have the authority to appropriate to experiment. That kind of reasoning followed to a logical conclusion means that if you want to build a ship for \$10,000,000 all you have to do is to label it an experiment. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is entirely right, and will the gentleman please ask our friend now to tell us wherein the jurisdiction lies.

Mr. BEGG. That is the point I have in mind.



Mr. BUTLER. Where would you draw the line—on a 5-cent ship or a \$10,000,000 ship?

Mr. BEGG. How far does authority to experiment rest with the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. FRENCH. I will say in response to the gentleman that there is a border line there that has never been determined by the Congress or by the rules of the House. We are appropriating money for experimentation touching airships. Is an airship a ship or is it not a ship?

Mr. BEGG. I would like to ask the gentleman a question which he can readily answer.

Mr. FRENCH. Let me first finish my statement. It has been contended by some that for every airplane you build you ought to have the specific authority of Congress. I do not think the Members feel that way about it. It is urged, on the other hand, that for a ship such as the proposed dirigible you must have the authority of Congress. The fact of the business is, I think it is up to the committee to endeavor to respect the wishes of the Congress in this regard, and it is a problem that is fairly subject, possibly, to debate under the rules whether or not we do have the authority to conduct such an experiment. Personally I think we have.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. And I am not doing this to take up the time, but I think it is vital. This thing you are proposing right now is vital to the rest of us in the House, and I want to ask the gentleman, Suppose some man should come along with a proposition that would flap its wings and fly, something unheard of, does the gentleman mean to say that under the authority of this House granted to the Committee on Appropriations, the committee could appropriate a million dollars or \$5,000,000 or \$500 to build one of those machines to experiment to see whether it was practical or not, without specific authority from Congress?

Mr. FRENCH. You mean without authority from Congress?

Mr. BEGG. Yes; without specific authority, I am talking about. I mean under the present rules, could you do that?

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, we might assume that an experiment on so extravagant a ship would not be made, but the House and not the committee must finally pass on any program.

Mr. BEGG. To make the illustration apropos we must make it extreme.

Mr. FRENCH. The department is to-day making experiments on all kinds of airplanes it believes are worth while.

Mr. BEGG. Absolutely, but I want to direct the attention of the gentleman to the fact that every dollar they are spending was given them by the Congress for the specific purpose of experimenting in that special field and not for buying new ships.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield? Did they not spend over \$200,000 on a helicopter?

Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BRITTEN, and Mr. AYRES rose.

Mr. AYRES. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Gentlemen of the House, I want to bring this discussion to an end and at the same time the subject is so important I do not want to seem to deny Members the right to ask questions. My colleague on the committee has arisen and I ought to yield to him before I answer the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] further, and I therefore yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mr. AYRES. I would suggest to my colleague that this is a matter that will have to be decided anyhow when a point of order is made, and I think it is useless to discuss it at this time. May I also make another observation, in view of the question asked? Is it not a fact that the experts of the Navy Department did come before our committee and state that while they were not recommending this appropriation for such a lighter-than-air ship, they did say it was worth trying out; and if it proved to be a success, it would be far superior to anything we have now?

Mr. FRENCH. There is no question as to the statements of experts from the department along the line of the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield right there, because of what transpired in his committee room the other day, which is not secret at all? Will the gentleman yield for one second?

Mr. FRENCH. I am compelled to yield to the gentleman, of course.

Mr. BRITTEN. Thank you very much. Is it not a fact that the Assistant Secretary of the Navy came into your committee room the other day and told you he had been directed by the

Secretary himself to tell you that the Navy Department did not want this Tin Lizzie at all?

Mr. FRENCH. Well, the gentleman is phrasing the proposition in language—

Mr. BRITTEN. Well, I will call it a metal-clad lighter-than-air ship. Did he not state the Navy Department does not want it, and the gentleman who is proposing it—

Mr. FRENCH. Let me answer your question. The gentleman wants to ask his question in his language and put the language to answer it in his own words. He has asked the question in his own language, and I propose to answer it. The gentleman from the department did not phrase the statement or the position of the department, as the gentleman has suggested; but as I said to the gentleman from Pennsylvania a bit ago, this proposition did not come from the department.

But the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] is correct in the statement that experts within the Bureau of Aeronautics believe it is a worth-while experiment to carry on; and as one of them said—and one of them in whom we have tremendous confidence—the United States would certainly be a poor sport unless it would match dollar for dollar such an experiment as this that held out the hopes that are held out if what is claimed for it can be attained.

#### INCREASE OF THE NAVY

For the current fiscal year there was appropriated under this head in the naval act \$7,444,000, and in the second deficiency act \$4,000,000. The latter act, however, carried further appropriations under this head totaling \$17,000,000, chargeable to the fiscal year 1925, but more properly chargeable to the current fiscal year. In effect, therefore, the current appropriations footed \$28,444,000. As against this, the committee is proposing, in harmony with the Budget, direct appropriations totaling \$28,275,000 and an indirect appropriation of \$5,000,000, representing a transfer to be effected from the working capital of the naval supply account fund.

The following table indicates the vessels now in course of construction on account of which appropriations are proposed in this bill:

Ship construction in progress

Number, type, and unit cost	Appropriated in this bill			Remaining to be appropriated
	Hull and machinery	Ordnance	Aviation	
2 aircraft carriers (\$47,612,500).....	\$8,000,000	-----	\$3,300,000	\$525,000
1 mine-laying submarine, V-4 (\$6,150,000).....	1,350,000	\$425,000	-----	-----
2 cruising submarines, V-5, V-6 (\$6,320,000).....	5,500,000	500,000	-----	4,140,000
2 light cruisers, Nos. 24 and 25 (\$16,750,000).....	7,400,000	3,600,000	-----	20,500,000
6 river gunboats (\$700,000).....	2,000,000	-----	-----	200,000
Total (13).....	24,250,000	4,525,000	3,300,000	25,365,000

<sup>1</sup> \$5,000,000 by transfer from naval supply account fund.

The aircraft carriers will be completed during the fiscal year, as will the submarine V-4. The construction which will extend beyond the fiscal year 1927 was all commenced during the present fiscal year, and, as the table indicates, will require future appropriations totaling \$25,365,000.

In addition to carrying forward work on vessels now under way, the Budget proposes and the committee is recommending an appropriation of \$1,200,000 for commencing three more (two are now under construction) of the eight light cruisers authorized in the act approved December 18, 1924 (43 Stat. 719). The total unit cost of these vessels is \$16,750,000. With respect to these cruisers, attention is called to the fact that the act authorizing their construction, contemplated that the entire number (eight) would be commenced before July 1, 1927. The committee, notwithstanding, has agreed with the Budget proposal to postpone the commencement of them in the realization that Congress will have convened again in regular session well before the time limit imposed in the authorizing act will have expired. It should be stated, however, that there is nothing in the language of the appropriations proposed to hinder the President from commencing these three vessels if he should conclude such course to be wise or necessary. By retarding work on other vessels, funds could be found for making a commencement. In the naval appropriation act approved August 29, 1916, authority was given for the construction of nine fleet submarines. Three of these submarines have not been commenced. The six for which appropriations have been provided do or will represent the acme of our naval architectural and engineering skill. The importance of this type of craft is obvious and that we should have more, in the absence of inter-



national limitation, is generally recognized by naval students. The committee is proposing that plans and estimates for the three submarines already authorized but not yet commenced shall be presented to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session.

Attention is called to the form in which the appropriations are stated. It is a return to the form employed prior to the Conference on the Limitation of Naval Armament. A direct allocation is set up by the Congress for each branch of the work, and it is believed that a better picture can be had of and a better check made or maintained on the funds requested or made available. Furthermore, by introducing a fixed ordnance cost, which is a new departure, we are better able to arrive at our total commitments when considering new undertakings.

Mr. BRITTEN. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think he is occupying an unusual attitude before the House when the committee says in one breath, through its chairman, we have declined to appropriate for a ship like the *Los Angeles* because we doubt our authority, and yet comes in here with an appropriation of \$300,000 for a metal ship which the Navy Department does not want and sent word that it does not want. I think the committee is occupying an unusual position.

Mr. FRENCH. I must decline to yield further. I decline to yield because I must bring this discussion to an end, and I must speak briefly of the new building program.

Gentlemen, our program should be supported because it means economy. It should be supported because it is adequate. It should be supported because we look forward to future conferences on armament limitation. It should be supported because it will make it easier for other nations to arrange their budget programs. The action that will be taken by this Congress will be observed by every other great nation in the world. If we make our program large this very reason will be cited by Great Britain as an argument for increasing her budget and by Japan as a reason for raising her expenditure for her naval establishment. More is involved than mere dollars. Let me cite an illustration: When the program for new construction of replacement cruisers was before the British Parliament on July 29, last, Captain Benn, in the House of Commons, pointed out that action looking to large expenditures of money in behalf of the British Navy would find its reaction in the United States. Captain Benn said: "We know that the eight ships which appear in the fleet estimates are not appropriated at all. The money has not been voted. The Americans have been holding their hands. I have little doubt that the result of our decision to-night will be to cause Congress to vote the money for these eight ships (the eight cruisers authorized by the Fifty-eighth Congress), and when that money is voted and the ships are laid down, they will be quoted in argument by speakers in this House as a reason for entering into a larger program of construction. We stand to-night at the parting of the ways."

That is the situation that addresses itself to us to-day. We are at the parting of the ways. Are you going to hold to a program that means economies with adequate defense, or are you going to follow a program that means an ever-increasing naval establishment for the United States? I appeal to you to support the program recommended by your committee. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the matters included in this bill have been so ably presented to the committee that I shall not undertake to discuss the bill at all, because it would be a repetition of a great deal that has been said by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. FRENCH], who has gone into it and discussed it from start to finish.

I do, however, feel that I may discuss some things that were developed during the hearings before the committee that would be of interest to the people over the United States and to this House. I refer to a number of activities engaged in by the Navy Department that is in no way a part of the naval proposition. A great deal of the \$317,000,000 carried in this bill goes to defraying expenses of these various activities. While I will not take the time to refer to all the activities in view of the time that has been taken by the chairman of the committee, I do want to refer to some of them for the information of the House and the general public.

However, before referring to these activities I do want to say as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee charged with its preparation there is but little I can add, except that it has my indorsement and approval. It calls for a total cash outlay of \$317,274,787, including \$5,000,000 by transfer from the naval supply account fund and a reappropriation of \$75,000 for certain aviation expenses.

My own judgment is that it hardly would be practicable to frame a bill for the proper support of the Navy carrying a smaller sum than here proposed. I mean by that, apart from new ship construction. Whether some of the amounts making up the total could be more wisely applied is another question.

For instance, we are told that the Boston and Charleston Navy Yards could just as well be closed and merely maintained in an inoperative status; that even the Philadelphia Navy Yard, with the exception of the aircraft factory, could be dispensed with, and yet no move is being made to close these establishments, and they are being operated with the usual large overhead and taking money which the Navy could well afford to put into ship repairs and improvements.

By this I mean that it does appear that we are devoting money to some objects which might just as well be thrown into the discard. I am inclined to believe that both the Navy and Congress to a certain extent are to blame. I have discovered that activities begun during the war and intended for war purposes in many instances are still being maintained at the expense of the Government, even though they may be useless, or practically so, at this time.

As I have said, the Navy is not altogether to blame. When an effort is made to close up a useless navy yard or training station, the Congressman in whose district it may be situated stands ready to fight for its continuance. I can realize it may be embarrassing for the Navy heads to insist upon abandoning these activities, or at least it has been in the past. Therefore it seems to me there is but one course to pursue, and that is for the naval authorities to state frankly the facts concerning these matters to this committee and for this committee to cease appropriating for the maintenance of such projects even though we have to fight it out with our colleagues.

The Navy is entitled to use every dollar appropriated for some necessary naval purpose, and the taxpayers are entitled to have the money appropriated used for the purpose of building up and maintaining a good Navy and not used for some project which is useless simply because some Representative may feel he is being outraged because he is going to have something taken from his district.

You know most people vision the Navy as a big war machine; little do they know of its peace-time missions and employments, and it is upon these I should like to throw some light, if I may.

Before doing so, however, I wish to illustrate the sphere in which the naval officer moves through life. It will recall to many of you, and bring to the attention of others, the rôle of our naval representatives at home and abroad. This calls to my mind what President Coolidge said in his address to the Naval Academy graduating class of 1925:

You have chosen a profession which represents one of the greatest military arms of our Government. You will be a constant testimony throughout your lives that America believes in military preparation for national defense, for the protection of the rights, the security, and peace of her citizens. You will be called to places of responsibility and command. You will be given the power of life and death over fellow countrymen. You will represent the power, the glory, and the honor of this Nation among foreign people, with all the prominence that arises from wearing the uniform and carrying the flag. What you are the American sailor will be, and what you represent the American Navy will represent in the ports of our own country and in those of foreign peoples where little will be known of the nature of authority under liberty save what is learned from you. You have been chosen for this high calling.

Not generally appreciated by the citizens of our country but forcefully praised by our late Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, is the Navy's part in initiating trade through diplomacy.

The increasing importance of our foreign trade—last year it amounted to well over \$8,000,000,000, including the marketing abroad of our surplus cotton, wheat, tobacco, mineral oils, automobiles and parts, flour, and many other commodities, and the importation of such vital necessities to our industrial and economic life as rubber, tin, manganese, jute, coffee, sugar, and silk—all this foreign trade which is transported overseas makes this promotion and protection of commerce by our Navy a tremendous industrial asset!

Other maritime nations also comprehend the importance of visits of friendship by naval vessels to foreign ports. Only recently a member of the House of Commons of Great Britain uttered a complaint in legislative session because naval vessels were not sent more frequently to South American ports, stating freely that immediately following a visit of their vessels of war to a large South American seaport, Great Britain had done a particularly large amount of business.



We are, however, not without many historical examples of naval diplomacy and the consequent trade following it. In 1826 Capt. Catesby Jones, of the Navy, negotiated a treaty with the native chiefs of Hawaii. While it was an excellent treaty, the Senate failed to ratify it. This hesitancy on the part of the Senate rendered much more difficult our future negotiations with the islands. In 1839, Commodore Wilkes during his scientific exploration of the Arctic and Southern Pacific Oceans was more successful when he made an agreement with the native chiefs of Samoa, which was subsequently the basis of our claim to the island of Tutuila.

Commodore Kearney in 1840 exercised initiative and judgment when, following the "opium war" in China, he resolutely demanded the same extension of trade concessions for the United States as were demanded of China by Great Britain. The principle of the "open door" and equal opportunities in China were, it is evident, herewith initiated by an American naval officer.

It was in 1853 that Commodore M. C. Perry succeeded where many others had failed in persuading the Japanese Government to open their ports to the commerce of the world, thus accomplishing an acknowledged feat of diplomatic genius. The last hermit kingdom of the world, Korea, was opened to world commerce through the efforts of Commodore Shufeldt in 1882.

Ground was broken by the Navy in Santo Domingo and Haiti for American commerce. In 1902, when John Hay was Secretary of State, he commented on the Navy's work after a revolution in the West Indies as follows:

I have always felt relieved when a naval officer had arrived on the scene, because he always kept within the situation.

In 1904 John Hay again remarked:

We have had a number of difficult international situations in the West Indies in the last two years, and they have all been handled by naval officers very well. They have not made one single mistake.

An outstanding example of the Navy's diplomatic work is afforded in the reappointment, at the request of the State Department, of Rear Admiral Mark L. Bristol as high commissioner to Turkey. Admiral Bristol was sent by the Navy to Constantinople soon after the armistice in Europe in 1918 to command the small American naval forces there. A large part of his efforts was devoted to the promotion and security of American commerce in the unsettled countries bordering the Black Sea. His intelligent grasp of the situation existing there led to his appointment by the State Department as high commissioner, with the subsequent request by that department for his reappointment. Daily we read in the newspapers that "at the request of the State Department," naval ships are transporting diplomatic agents on special missions over the oceans. The dignity of a naval vessel creates an impression befitting such errands of diplomacy. We read that the battleship *Utah* furnished transportation for the State Department's mission, headed by General Pershing, to South America from November 20, 1924, to March 13, 1925, the *Utah* steaming 17,250 miles on this mission, utilizing at the same time the opportunity for the regular, continuous peace-time training of the ship's personnel. We read that the U. S. S. *Rochester* transported the Tacna-Arica mission from Key West to Arica, and remained at that port until December 3, when she was relieved by the U. S. S. *Denver*; that the Chileans and citizens of Peru were exceedingly pleased with the courtesy of the admiral on board the *Rochester*; also, that the *Denver*, or some other ship of the special service squadron will remain at the disposal of the mission until its work is completed. We read, further, that at the request of the countries concerned, naval missions are now at Brazil and Peru, instructing their naval officers, fostering closer relations; and that sending a similar mission to Mexico is now under consideration.

Our citizens abroad know the Navy. In China, on more than one occasion, the prompt dispatching of a division of destroyers from our Asiatic Fleet to protest the bombardment of Canton by contending forces engaged in almost ceaseless civil war, has spared not only the lives of our own citizens there but also those of other equally grateful inhabitants. In September and October, 1924, and again in the fall of 1925, our Asiatic Fleet spread its protecting wing over Shanghai and the lower Yangtze River. Without the services of our gunboats on the Yangtze and South China patrols, which penetrate some sixteen hundred miles up river, American business men and missionaries frankly state that should this patrol be discontinued they would have to leave simultaneously.

Down in the turbulent Caribbean countries, revolutionists have learned that it is futile to challenge the protection

afforded by our Navy's Special Service Squadron to our tremendous fruit, sugar, and hemp trades, as well as our oil and mining interests.

In European waters, the dispatch of two destroyers to Beirut has served recently to shield our nationals from injuries while the Druses and French threw the region thereabouts into bloody turmoil. In 1923 and 1924, our naval forces there answered calls from our ministers to Greece and Albania, where revolutions created precarious situations.

In September, 1922, when the Greek army of occupation retired in utter rout from Smyrna, our destroyers were on hand to protect our nationals and to guard our oil, tobacco, and flour trade commodities. Again, in October, 1923, the moral effect of a searchlight thrown by the U. S. destroyer *Simpson* upon the pier at Samsoun at the request of the Americans there had a stabilizing result that can not be overestimated. In commenting on the work of our small European naval detachment, the director of the foreign department of the Near East Relief praises unstintingly the efficiency of this force—and here I quote—

as a positive and quiet force for the security of American citizens working in the Near East, whether on business, in missions, or philanthropy.

I desire at this time to call to your attention the splendid services our Navy has rendered in a humanitarian way. I wonder how many people in our Nation realize that the Navy's errands of mercy have saved more lives than ever have been destroyed by the Navy's guns in all our wars. And lives, not only of our own citizens but also of citizens of foreign countries. I will not need to quote many instances of this work of philanthropy and first aid to prove my point.

When earthquake, tidal wave, and fire laid the region of Tokyo Bay, Japan, in ruins September 1, 1923, the services of our Asiatic Fleet were placed at the disposal of the Japanese Government, and stores and medical supplies were rushed to the scene of disaster. The U. S. destroyer *Stewart* was the first foreign man-of-war to arrive with aid, and other ships of our Navy rapidly followed her with succor. The naval forces rendered such heroic assistance that when the fleet took its departure it carried away the warmest gratitude of the Government and the people of Japan and hundreds of American citizens and foreigners whom it had aided in the greatest disaster of modern times.

In 1922, following the evacuation of the Greek army from Smyrna, fire broke out in several quarters of the city, devastating the foreign sections. Three hundred thousand refugees from outlying districts, and stragglers from the routed army, were left destitute and homeless. It was decided that the refugees must be evacuated. They were fed and transported away from the scene of horror on board the United States destroyers and other ships requisitioned under orders of the senior American naval officer present. This American naval officer had to insist on an extension of the time limit allowed by the Turks for evacuation. At another time, an American naval officer's requests delayed the bombardment of the Turkish port of Samsoun by the Greek fleet, so that American citizens and American property could be removed to a place of safety.

Previous to the great task of evacuating Smyrna, our High Commissioner to Turkey, Admiral Bristol, had cooperated with the Allies in finding homes and employment for over 100,000 Russian refugees in Constantinople, and, seeing the necessity for an organization to take care of the refugee problem, this same high commissioner, an American naval officer, organized the Smyrna disaster relief committee.

Closer home we find that assistance was sent by the Navy to the British Leeward Islands of Tortola and Anegada in August, 1924, when the Virgin Islands were swept by a West Indian hurricane. Also that the citizens and officials of Santa Barbara, Calif., were deeply grateful for the aid rendered by the Navy when the earthquake of June 29, 1925, threw that city into a state of havoc and horror. The Navy sent ships and supplies immediately, established a marine guard and blue-jacket patrol ashore, maintained a relief station on shore, and kept open communications to the outside world.

Going back into history the score for our Navy rises high. The famine in the Loo Choo Islands in 1832 and the great famine in 1843 in Ireland found our Navy ships on hand with relief supplies of food and clothing. The Navy furnished first aid following the earthquakes on the island of Chios in 1881, at Martinique in 1902, San Francisco in 1906, Jamaica in 1907, Messina in 1908, and Chile in 1922. Always cooperating closely with our magnificent relief organizations, the Navy has placed its name high on the roll of honor for missions of mercy to humanity in distress.



I have spoken of the cooperation rendered by our Navy to relief organizations and to the State Department. I would like now to mention in passing instances of the cooperation of our Navy Department with other governmental agencies. At present the States of Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania are using naval gunboats for the maintenance of merchant-marine nautical schools, and the Navy, besides lending these vessels to the States, is also contributing an adequate sum of money each year toward the upkeep of each ship. Navy personnel mans the Bureau of Fisheries vessel *Fish Hawk* for the Department of Commerce, and the Navy Department gives that bureau every aid possible in carrying out their work. The vessels of the naval transportation service, in addition to the carrying of naval personnel, transport Government officials and civilian employees. Small quantities of freight for other Government departments are carried by the naval transportation service where there are no regular steamship lines available. The naval transportation service carries explosives for the Panama Canal authorities. The naval transportation service transported the 16-inch guns for the defense of Hawaii and guns and armor plate for the defense of Panama. The supply ship *Vega*, at the request of the Department of Commerce, transported personnel and supplies to the radio and sealing stations in the Pribilof Islands and Bering Sea ports in the summer of 1925, showing an actual money saving to the Federal Treasury of about \$15,000. The naval communication service handled last year, not including the work of radiocompass stations, a total volume of 24,457,031 words for other departments or agencies of the Government. Radio-equipped naval seaplanes flying over the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are co-operating with the United States Weather Bureau in the work of forecasting meteorological conditions. At the request of the War Department, naval vessels guarded the Army around-the-world flight, 33 ships being employed, at a cost of \$321,157.30 for fuel, these vessels being diverted from regular naval duties for a total of 128 days. Many other examples such as these come to mind, but I will pass to another subject.

Turning now to the vast business of American manufacturing, I shall endeavor to give you an insight for a moment into the important part our Navy has played and is constantly playing in the development of home industries.

The Navy's demand for high-grade armor and ship plates in 1887 for its steel ships, forced, in the opinion of no less an authority than Andrew Carnegie, the present-day American steel industry. When the World War cut off the supply of optical glass from Germany, the Navy's requirements for this commodity, and the Navy's cooperation, resulted in the firm foundation for the manufacture of this important product at home. The Navy's experimental model basin, in which its ship models are tested for efficient performance before the ships are built, has been constantly available to and used by civilian shipbuilders. Navy standard specifications for various materials and machines have set high commercial standards. Naval influence has been of value in the adoption and development of electrical ship propulsion and in propulsion by heavy oil-burning internal-combustion engines.

The Navy's cooperation with aircraft-engine manufacturers has led to America's supremacy in aircraft-engine plants. The Navy pioneered in the work of building rigid airships in this country and has in this and many other ways pointed the way to the development of a new industry and the creation of a new sphere of commercial activity.

Nor should it be overlooked, in passing, that another recent manufacturing art—radio—was introduced into the American field by the demand, research, and development of the Navy. The establishment of 100 per cent American-owned commercial radio companies came about as a result of conferences—just before we plunged into the World War—in which, to insure the secrecy of our overseas communications, naval officers took a leading part. The ensuing development and research of radio in this country has profited by the coordinating efforts of our Navy's work along lines of war-time preparedness in this art of communication.

The Navy is constantly engaged in research, and in this it holds many honors in the promotion of science. Research work is carried out in radio and sound apparatus at the Naval Research Laboratory, Bellevue, and on naval vessels. Improved navigational tables and methods are worked out both at the Naval Academy and the Naval Observatory, and also at the Hydrographic Office, the results being published by the latter and given out to the shipping world. Types of fuels and lubricants are constantly being tested at the naval experimental station, Annapolis, to find the most economical and best type to use. The Naval Bureau of Ordnance is experimenting with success on a rust-preventing compound to be used on steel. Before the United States helium production

plant at Fort Worth, Tex., was transferred on July 1, 1925, by act of Congress, from the jurisdiction of the Navy Department to the Bureau of Mines, Department of Commerce, the Navy, operating the plant, had reduced the cost of helium from \$200 per thousand cubic feet in 1922, to \$25 to \$30 per thousand cubic feet in June, 1925. The National Industrial Conference Board, made up of an imposing array of organizations representing manufacturing, has enlisted, among other governmental agencies, the services of a bureau of the Navy Department in making a special study of the cost of distribution of this country's overproduction of farm products. I may say I am in hopes this board will succeed better than has other governmental agencies, including Congress.

Naval medical officers, while stamping out disease in Guam, Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, where naval governors are in charge, have made invaluable contributions to the knowledge of medical science as applicable to tropical regions. A naval doctor paved the way for suppression of fever in the Tropics during the construction of the great Panama Canal. The Navy is testing the capabilities of heavier and lighter than air craft with a view to furthering naval and commercial aviation. This committee has such confidence in naval experts along this line we have increased the appropriation \$300,000 to experiment in lighter-than-air craft.

I do not need to remind you that the vast maritime world on which our commercial products are carried to the seven corners of the globe, and on which our citizens travel abroad, depends upon our Navy to an incalculable degree for its charts, radiocompass bearings, and sailing directions in order that the ships of all nations may continue their business in as safe and sure a manner as the winds and oceans will permit. The Navy is ceaselessly at work here in its element. The Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department prepares and prints navigational charts, Notices to Mariners, Changes in Charts, Notices to Aviators, a Weekly Bulletin, Pilot Charts, Sailing Directions, Light Lists of the World, Pilots of Foreign Waters—all, vital to the master mariner—and has charge of the sale of the above publications to the merchant marine. The naval communications service maintains radiocompass stations along the United States coasts, which give radio bearings to all ships requesting them. Accordingly, ships accurately locate their positions during foggy weather. The volume of this traffic in 1925 totaled 137,592 bearings for 5,765 naval and 58,723 merchant vessels. Navy radio stations give out time signals, storm warnings, weather reports, notifications of any derelicts or other dangers likely to be encountered at sea.

Surveys of the oceans are constantly being carried on in localities which have not as yet been accurately charted. The three regular naval survey vessels—the *Hannibal*, *Nokomis*, and *Niagara*—are now charting the south coast of Cuba and the Gulf of Venezuela. In addition to the regular survey ships, vessels of the Special Service Squadron, which operates in the Caribbean, survey any reported shoals in their theater of action. Lines of sounding are made by naval vessels crossing the oceans by means of sonic depth finders. The most recent sonic survey was made by the U. S. S. *Colorado* while she was steaming back to the United States from Australia and New Zealand.

Survey and exploration expeditions have been sent to the outlying islands of the Hawaiian group, and to Christmas, Jarvis, and Palmyra Islands to the southward in the Pacific. The Navy placed—from the 15th of April to the 12th of June, 1925—the minesweeper *Ortolan* at the disposal of scientists from the California Academy of Sciences during their minute geological and biological survey in the Pacific Ocean of the Revillin Gligedo Islands, Las Tres Marias Island, and points of the west coast of Mexico. Naval airplanes have mapped our naval oil reserves.

Plans have been made for naval aircraft to survey Kingmans Reef and Palmyra Island in the southern Pacific in 1926 and, at the request of the Interior Department, to map photographically the 40,000 square miles contained in that inaccurately charted section known as southeastern Alaska.

Our men-of-war while cruising throughout the world are constantly going to the rescue of ships in distress. The naval tanker *Brazos* only recently searched for and towed into Pilon Harbor, Cuba, on November 30, 1925, the Haitian ship *Ville des Cayes*, which had been adrift for five days because of broken-down machinery and had 400 passengers on board. The services of the U. S. S. *Trenton*, one of our modern light cruisers, were employed from November 3 to the 14th last year in a search for the missing Danish ship *Leiv Eiriksson*. When the Italian aviator Locatelli dropped to the icy ocean south of Greenland, the U. S. cruisers *Richmond* and *Raleigh*, the destroyer *Barry*, and naval planes were ordered by the Navy Department to comb the seas for him. A lookout on board the



U. S. S. *Richmond* saw a lighted flare on the drifting plane the night of August 25, 1924, and Locatelli with his mechanician were picked up by the cruiser. The destroyer *Bainbridge* effected a rescue in the Sea of Marmora, Turkey, on December 16, 1922, which upheld the highest traditions of an heroic service. The French transport *Vinh-Long*, with 496 passengers on board, caught fire at sea. The *Bainbridge*, en route to Constantinople, was maneuvered alongside by her gallant commander, rescuing 482 of the passengers despite the panic on board incident to a series of explosions which twice blasted the destroyer away from the transport's side and caused many persons to be blown into the sea. I was on this vessel, the *Bainbridge*, last summer cruising among the Hawaiian Islands. It was exceedingly interesting to hear her officers tell of this wonderful act in rescuing the passengers from the *Vinh-Long*.

As you observe, gentlemen, from the brief touches of its manifold activities which I have deemed it a privilege to present, our Navy is a great, going concern which, preparing itself daily as an instrument of war, actually becomes an industrial asset of silent, progressive strength during times of peace. And in the performance of these duties we must not forget the rôle played by the Navy as a training school for youth. Annually this great American university, with its carefully prepared trade courses and its essential naval discipline, turns out about 20,000 graduates. These graduates return to civil life with a conspicuous improvement in personal bearing, health, physical strength, technical skill, knowledge of the world, respect for genuine authority, and civic responsibility. Who can gainsay that they are not assets to their community, State, and Nation for having been taught discipline, self-restraint, clean living, the building of character—for having been instilled with the principles of Americanism, those high principles of inherent respect for the Constitution, the law, and ideals for which our great country stands?

In conclusion I can say that I agree with President Coolidge when he said:

Our people should realize what the Navy has done for the country in the past, not only in war but in peace. They should know that the Navy is not a financial burden, but an industrial asset that has returned more in economical value than its cost; that it has never caused a war or tempted the country to go to war.

[Applause.]

Thus, gentlemen, it can be seen that the \$317,279,287 appropriation carried in this bill is not for the sole purpose of building up a huge war machine but an industrial asset as well, and I have tried to throw some light on this peace-time Navy of ours and reveal it in its splendid entirety. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, in the month of October a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, accompanied part of the way by a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, at the invitation of the Federal land banks and the Federal intermediate credit banks, made a visitation of all of the land banks and intermediate credit banks in the United States. It was for the purpose of learning first hand the problems that were confronting both the banks and their owners, the farmers, and the matter of legislation, that might be judicious in order to solve some of the problems still unsolved. We started at Springfield, Mass. We were on the road 27 days, and we spent 19 of the nights on Pullman cars, working in the daytime and riding at night. I believe we attended 26 collations and made enough speeches, if printed, to encumber the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the exclusion of the speech of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER] made yesterday on the tariff question. We got back weighing more than we started out with, but we did get a lot of information on these banks.

In the first place, I shall discuss for a moment the physical condition of the banks. The banks are owned, organized, and manned by farmers. Two years ago, against the advice of many of the wisecracks of this country—and, by the way, at first of the Farm Loan Board itself—we placed the control of the banks in the hands of their stockholders, to wit, the farmers, who owned them. We gave them the right to name four out of the seven directors, and there were a good many dire predictions that they would borrow loosely after that, because the owners were the borrowers, but it proved to be the other way around. The borrower is the owner, and after he has borrowed he is going to look after it to see that he does not lose, and that has not only not worked to the detriment of the banks but great wisdom has been shown in the selection of the directors, and great wisdom has been shown in the management of the banks.

Ten of the banks have buildings of their own, and that is an index to the economic ideas of the people who run the banks.

Ten of these banks have built their own buildings, and they have expended for the buildings \$2,370,000.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. No building has been constructed in the city of Wichita, Kans., for the land bank out there, has it?

Mr. STEVENSON. There are two places where they have not constructed buildings yet: One is at Wichita, Kans., and I shall state to the gentleman in confidence, so that he can use it as he pleases, that the impression given us was that the minute the Wichita people made it possible for a proper lot to be acquired at a proper price, and location, there would be a building put up there. That is all they are waiting for.

Mr. AYRES. Then I shall see if we can not have that done as quickly as I get home.

Mr. STEVENSON. That seemed to be the only difficulty. They have the money, and they need the building.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. How does the cost of their buildings compare with the cost of the buildings of the Federal reserve banking system?

Mr. STEVENSON. In New Orleans the building is not complete; but they know what the cost will be, and there is another one in course of construction, and there is no building started as yet at Wichita, as I state, for the reason that they could not get a proper lot. Ten of them are completed and are contained in the financial statement. Those 10 buildings cost \$2,370,000, an average of \$237,000 each. The Federal reserve banks have 12, and they cost \$61,809,000, which is 53 per cent of the capital of all of the Federal reserve banks, being an average of \$5,150,750 for each building. That makes a comparison between the management of the financial magnates of the country and the management of the farmers when they get to running a banking institution.

Mr. TINCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. TINCER. The Wichita Farm Loan Bank is the best one in the system, is it not?

Mr. STEVENSON. I am not going to enter into invidious comparisons, but the Wichita bank is a most splendidly organized institution. If I had to say which is the best, I could tell you which has lost the least, which is the lowest in default, which has the cleanest slate, which has practically everything right up to date, and that is the bank at Houston, Tex., manned by a gentleman who is a native of South Carolina, and the Wichita and the New Orleans banks are right up in the same class.

Mr. TINCER. Then they ought to have a building at Wichita, and I hope my friend from Kansas will arrange for the lot.

Mr. STEVENSON. They are entitled to a building. It is a splendidly run bank.

Mr. AYRES. I promise my colleague from the West that I shall arrange for the lot.

Mr. STEVENSON. And I want to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] that the man who runs the bank at Wichita, and who has made a splendid institution out of it, is a Texan. All three of them are good banks, and all the banks are run well, some better than others.

Mr. LUCE. Making a comparison as between the land banks and the Federal reserve banks, the gentleman would not ignore the possible difference between the land values in Houston and one of the great centers of population.

Mr. STEVENSON. I would not, but I happen to have an instance right in mind in the city of St. Paul and in the city of Minneapolis. In the city of St. Paul the Federal land bank has acquired and fitted up a splendid bank building, with every equipment necessary, and the building stands on the books of the bank at \$175,000. They drove us over to the Federal Reserve Bank Building, which is in Minneapolis, across an imaginary line, and we found that they have a magnificent building there, which cost three and a half million dollars. That is the difference. Let me tell you one of the differences, and I pointed this out to some of the New Englanders who were along. They took us into the Federal Reserve Bank Building, and they began to show us the magnificent marble. It was all trimmed in Italian marble, and the man said that it came from Italy, and was dressed in Italy, and numbered, each stone, and all they had to do was to set the stones in place when they got here, and this notwithstanding the fact that marble underlies the whole of that northwestern country within 100 or 75 miles of where we were. I asked the man how they had taken care of the American laborer and American raw material. Then we got into the great counting room,



where they had teakwood floors. I was not familiar with them, nor was my friend from Kansas [Mr. Strong].

It turned out that it was wood which was gotten in the jungles of India and carried out by elephants and sawed by coolie labor in India. It is splendid to walk on, but it expands so they have to put a little segment of cork in each joint so that the cork would shrink and spread as it contracts or expands; and when my friend Strong walked in and looked at it he said, "Where in the world did you get this floor? It looks to me like my dairy-barn floor down in Kansas." And it does; and yet they went all the way to India to get the most expensive wood in the world, brought by elephants out of the jungle and worked up by the people of India, who get about 15 cents a day, and brought over here, when the whole Northwest is full of hardwood of the finest kind.

Mr. McSWAIN. If the gentleman will permit, has the gentleman's curiosity induced him to see whether or not teakwood is on the free list?

Mr. STEVENSON. I have not. It does not make any difference if it was \$100 a thousand feet. That is the difference between our farm-loan banks and some of these. However, I did not intend to institute any invidious comparisons, but there is the difference. You have got 53 per cent of the capital of the Federal reserve banks in great buildings in this country when money is the thing you do business with. You can not pay with brick and mortar, with marble or teak wood; you need money and you have to get money. It is like Russell Sage was in the panic of 1907, when he had millions of actual cash locked up in the vaults, and he got 25 per cent regardless of how long they got it. Money is the thing that banks need and that is the one thing the farm-loan banks are standing for.

Now, as to looking at the size of the banks. The greatest of them is Omaha, with \$127,000,000 assets. St. Paul is close to it, with \$123,000,000, Houston \$118,000,000, New Orleans \$105,000,000, Louisville \$102,000,000, Spokane \$100,000,000, Wichita \$93,000,000, St. Louis \$74,000,000, Columbia \$68,000,000, Baltimore \$60,000,000, Berkeley \$44,000,000, and Springfield \$33,000,000, making a total of \$1,064,000,000 which the farmers by cooperation have gotten together. Now, to discuss for a minute the operations of them. I remember—all of you do—that we had a great question about whether we should let this institution go into Porto Rico or not. I was very doubtful about that but I finally voted for it, and we voted that they should have a limit of \$5,000 as a maximum loan. Subsequently we increased that to \$10,000, and I tell you that bank is being run as a branch of the Baltimore bank, and when we were there in October there never had been one borrower delinquent down there on a single payment. It is a remarkable thing. Those people down there think they belong to Uncle Sam, and I think they think that if they do not pay these installments down there the Army and Navy will go down there after them. There never has been a delinquent payment on any of these loans. That is the justification of the act of Congress in giving them the opportunity. [Applause.]

They have \$8,000,000 loaned out there in that branch. I tell you it was a gratifying thing to me to find our judgment so thoroughly justified. Well, you say, what about the management of the banks? I just want to give you one instance to show you how splendid has been the organization. I want to say to you that Judge Lobdell, of Kansas, has supervised all of this and has accomplished the most statesmanlike management of all of these institutions, and you did hear a great deal of criticism by certain alleged statesmen of another body because he is a financial agent now at a salary of \$25,000 a year. He sells bonds of the intermediate credit banks and Federal reserve banks, and is one of the most competent men connected with the system. He went up and saw personally to the organization of them. There are over a billion dollars of coupon bonds out. Those coupons come in just as coupon bonds of the United States come into the Treasury, except each bank's coupons goes to its own bank ultimately. They have the most complete system there in each bank that is managed by one woman, and it takes not more than half of her time, so when a coupon comes in immediately it is recorded, it is in and paid, and then it is filed in order so in a minute or two you can find it. All you have to do is to give the number of the coupon and bond, and in two or three minutes it can be found. What has been the result of it? Why, you heard all of this talk about duplicate bonds which the United States Government has been paying and duplicate coupons, and there is millions of it. That thing can not occur with the farm-loan banks because the very minute the duplicate comes in the first thing they do is to turn to the book to see if that

coupon has been paid, and they find that it is paid, and so it is investigated and run down. Immediately a duplication arises of coupons of the same date and same maturity they begin an investigation and run it down.

"Oh, well," you may say, "how can you tell which is good and which is bad?" They have their coupons so arranged that they can immediately turn to the coupon that has been paid and compare them, and then take them to the original bond and show whether this coupon is good and the other is spurious. They can settle it at once. It is the cheapest method possible, and it guards the treasury of the land banks just as the Treasury of the United States ought to be guarded by the system which has been abolished because they say it will cost \$75,000 a year to do it. I say it would not. They have investigated every case in which duplicate coupons have been printed. It can be detected. Why? Because they have the information right there, and you have a coupon to compare with it, and you know where the bond is, and you can determine it at once. In one instance there was a \$1,000 coupon presented which was immediately detected and sent back with the statement, "There is something wrong about this. The one that has been paid is the genuine one, and this is the spurious one." The spurious one immediately dropped out of sight, and nothing more was heard about it, but that duplicate would have been paid if it had not been detected in that way.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Can they duplicate these bonds?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. Once in awhile you will find that the numbering machine may not have worked all the time, and two bonds may be numbered the same.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. You say there have been fraudulent farm-loan bonds found?

Mr. STEVENSON. They have all been explained except one, and that was eventually found to be a fraudulent one, or at least the holder withdrew the coupon and never presented any more. They have a machine set up by Judge Lobdell, which works like an automatic machine. That is a safeguard which used to prevail at the Treasury of the United States and which we demanded in the report filed last spring should be reestablished here, but it has been discontinued because they say it caused too much trouble. But it would be a mere bagatelle in cost to protect the United States in that way, with \$20,000,000 of bonds outstanding.

Mr. ALMON. How much does it cost?

Mr. STEVENSON. Well, there is a lady clerk that attends to it, and she gets about \$1,500 a year. There are 12 of them.

Now what have the banks done about the bonds? If you look at the statement of the bank you will find the bonds are backed by live collateral, not in default. You know when an installment is over 90 days past due they charge it off and put it in suspense account. They do not carry that in their active account at all. When a mortgage is foreclosed they charge it off and leave only the live mortgages on their books.

The experience is that they have not lost 10 per cent of the money invested in land where they had to buy it in. To-day they have, altogether, out of \$1,000,000,000, \$6,000,000 of real estate which has been charged off, but they will get practically the value of it, with the exception of the great area over in Montana, which threatened to cripple the Spokane bank which went into wheat raising under the inspiration of war prices. They made wheat for a few years with remarkable success. People crowded in there and made extensive improvements all over that country. However, you can ride to-day on the Great Northern trains a whole day and see beautiful homesteads that have been deserted because they found it practically impossible to raise wheat there three years out of four.

The Spokane bank had not enough collateral to take care of its bonds after charging off the lands taken under foreclosure there. They have got to put out a fresh mortgage to back the bonds in the register when a mortgage is foreclosed and the land bought. But we have other banks with splendid surplus accounts and unimpaired credits and assets free, amounting to \$50,000,000. What did they do? They just came up and took the \$3,000,000 worth of land and took it over and charged it off to profit and loss and appointed a committee to make the best disposition they could with it.

But that was one of the things that could not be foreseen. The Spokane bank and the other banks will lose but an insignificant amount if they are handled judiciously hereafter. That illustrates the power of the combination. Here is a calamity that strikes one territory in the country. It



impairs the power of the farmers to meet their obligations. It makes so much paper in default that the banks in that section are insufficient in collateral to meet the bonds. But the other banks are ready and able to respond and charge the expense out of profit and loss, and when they restore it they place it in a profit account. That is the only instance of that kind that has happened.

They have had a great deal of trouble with two things, with taxes and the irrigation and reclamation projects. Many of these irrigation projects are private, bonded to death, injudiciously managed, pumped out until the water level is below where they can get water. Many of them are bonded until the debt against them is \$150 on every acre in them. In the Berkeley district, constituted by Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and California, but very largely California, the average per acre indebtedness against the reclamation land is \$41 an acre. That stands ahead, except on United States projects. That stands ahead of the farm-loan bonds, and consequently the farm-loan banks have had to get out of it. They have found it injudicious to loan money in many of those places where they need water. You can not know how it will pay. They take the water out until it gets below the level where the pump will reach it. That is one of the great difficulties that they have out in the western country.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. The banks in that territory employ experienced irrigation engineers to advise them as to the situation and condition of the irrigation projects there?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. They must have the most experienced irrigation engineers that are to be had, and they have them go to the bottom of every project. They do not loan any money until these engineer appraisers tell them it is safe to loan it in that community.

Now, there is a great deal of complaint about the fact that the Government has loaned money on all sorts of projects out there. They had a bitter experience in northern Montana, eastern Washington, and in the great bend of the Columbia River in Washington. What happened there? The great bend of the Columbia River was grazing country; it was in an arid region, but they were getting along pretty well. But they wanted to get rich all at once, and a lot of speculators and land grabbers got in there, and they said, "We must irrigate it and we will make it the garden spot of the world." They did irrigate it, and it was all right for a year or two. They rushed in and borrowed a lot of money from the Spokane bank to improve their land, but the application of water to the land brought the alkali to the top, and there is a large part of it which will be an alkali desert for all eternity. The black alkali has destroyed it, and they have not found any way to counteract it. It is said that white alkali will be removed after some years of cultivation and proper handling, but that is not true of black alkali. That is just one of the problems they got up against there. They loaned money on this land; it looked like a safe venture, but it was a disaster.

They had another experience at the St. Paul bank. The St. Paul bank loaned money on a project in Wisconsin where there was a tremendous bog that covered about all of one county there. The agricultural college fellows said it would be the garden spot of Wisconsin if they could just drain it. They were getting an income from ferns, evergreens, grasses, and other vegetation which grew in the swamp, but they induced the State of Wisconsin to spend many hundreds of thousands of dollars in draining it.

They rushed in there and bought it in quarter sections and borrowed money from the St. Paul bank to improve it and help pay for it. However, when they planted it it would not sprout anything; it is now an arid desert and absolutely waste land, and they are endeavoring to-day to get water back on it, so that they can begin to grow ferns and grasses again. That is another of the kind of problems which the land banks have been up against. But they are being educated and they are not lending much money out there on risky projects.

You know, the evidence everywhere is universal, with the exception of New England, that the interest rate on real estate loans has been reduced on an average of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. That is not true of New England, because there a slight accession to the rate has resulted, but that is entirely explainable. The old rate was about 4 per cent; the savings bank rate. There has been a tremendous demand for money to invest in Florida and other places like that, and some of the constituents of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] withdrew their money and the banks called their real estate loans and sent it to Florida to invest in sunshine or moonshine. The result was to raise the rate to about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent there. If it had not been for the farm land bank they would not have been able to get their money out of the farm loans they had, but the general level has been reduced  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Do you realize that the loans

in the United States on farm mortgages amount to \$10,000,000,000, and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent per annum is \$250,000,000, and that is about the amount the system is saving to-day. But, you say, they loan only \$1,000,000,000 of it, and that is true, but they have come to where they dominate the price of long-time farm money, because they handle such a large percentage of the business that the other people have had to meet them, not only on rates, but on amortization, and money is now being loaned for a long term of years without renewal. That has been one of the accomplishments of the Federal farm land banks.

There is another. You take it in my country; a man who borrows \$1,000 has to pay 8 per cent, and he has got to pay it every year. In addition he has to pay a renewal fee every now and then. When he borrows \$1,000 and pays 8 per cent, that is \$80 a year. If he pays interest on that loan for 35 years, he has not only paid \$2,800 in interest but he still owes the \$1,000. I have here the amortization table of the Federal land banks; it works out and it is guaranteed. If a man borrows \$1,000 from a Federal land bank, he pays \$62.50, being  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent interest, and that is applied on both principal and interest, and when he pays that \$62.50 a year for  $34\frac{1}{2}$  years he has paid all of his debt. He has not only done that but he has paid \$517.50 less than he would have paid if he had an 8 per cent loan. He has paid his debt, whereas if he had an 8 per cent loan under the old rule he would have paid \$517 more and still owed the \$1,000. That is the difference, and it means the difference between the success and the destruction of the agricultural people of this country.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman is making a very interesting speech on this subject. I would like to ask him whether his committee, during their investigations, which no doubt proved very interesting to the committee and of value to the country, gave thought to the proposition of increasing the percentage that would be permitted to be loaned?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. LUCE. The gentleman's exceedingly valuable statement is so helpful that I wish he would take enough time so that he will not overlook telling us about the condition of the intermediate credit banks.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman will have to intercede with the gentlemen who have time at their disposal. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] has been extremely kind in giving me this time and I do not want to take more of his time than is absolutely necessary. Answering the gentleman from Oklahoma, I will say that we considered that proposition, but considering the situation of the people in this country and the fact that there are \$9,000,000,000, or more, of farm loans that ought to be absorbed by this system, we do not deem it proper to recommend that more than 50 per cent of the appraised value be loaned on any real estate. It is a safe margin, and they have had \$6,000,000 of real estate out of \$1,000,000,000 on their hands as a result of loaning on only 50 per cent, and we thought it was safe to leave that just as it is.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What is the amount of the other loans made by the joint-stock companies?

Mr. STEVENSON. The joint-stock companies have loaned \$500,000,000. A billion five hundred million dollars has been taken up by the two systems.

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] asked for some statement about the Federal intermediate credit banks. I was just coming to that point. The loans to the farmers are capital loans, production loans, and marketing loans. The principal capital loan, of course, is a loan to purchase and settle himself on his farm. That is furnished by the land bank. Then there is the capital loan for people out in the West who want to buy a herd of cattle with a view to raising them. That is a capital loan.

The basis of his herd, as the gentleman from Colorado knows, who is a cattleman or has been a cattleman, is a capital requirement, and consequently the intermediate credit bank has to take care of that because the commercial banks can not. They can make the loans for three years which gives them time to bring on a crop of calves and get them ready for market. There is a great deal of this done by the intermediate credit banks.

Then the production loans made to farmers who are producing an annual crop are made now and beginning to be made very extensively by the intermediate credit banks by discounting the paper of agricultural credit corporations. The farmers



will get together and form their agricultural credit corporation. They did it in my State last year in an area that had disasters and did not have either the credit or the banking facilities to do business at all. They got their money through this credit corporation and it cost them about 6 per cent. They redeemed themselves and made a splendid crop and the intermediate credit bank did not lose a cent. It collected 100 per cent, so I was told when I was home during the holidays, and that has been its history everywhere. They get these loans at a low rate. They are all combined in a cooperative movement and they have made good and have paid their loans when they were due because the loans are due to an institution that has been a beneficiary to them.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. I assume the gentleman refers to what we call the Pee Dee section.

Mr. STEVENSON. I was referring to the coast section and not the Pee Dee section.

Mr. McSWAIN. The gentleman will remember that the Pee Dee section had practically four years of crop failures.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; the Pee Dee and the coast section also.

Mr. McSWAIN. In corroboration of what the gentleman has said, I remind him that in my section, which is the Piedmont section, there was practically a total crop failure in 1925 on account of a drought, and it is the hope, and the sole hope, of the farmers of that section that the intermediate credit banks will enable them to make a success this year.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; and that is simply an illustration of the facilities we have provided by the intermediate credit banks. Here is a territory devastated last year which does not have the capital with which to produce another crop, and this intermediate credit bank steps in and finances them and they come back. Then this year there is another section that has been burnt out by drought and they have to be helped during this next year. They will get this help and they will be back next year good and strong, and the help is distributed over such a large area that it takes care of the emergencies and there is practically no loss in it. [Applause.]

Now to sum up and conclude.

The credit needs of the farmer of America are divided into three general classes:

First. The capital loans, which include the purchase, improvement, and equipment of the farms and the purchase of herds of livestock for production purposes.

Second. The production loans, being the loans necessary to purchase fertilizer and seed and pay for labor necessary to cultivate and harvest the crop.

Third. Marketing loans, which are necessary to finance the crop after it is made, pay off the production loan, and enable the farmers to market their crops in an orderly way without glutting the market, distributing the market over a period of months instead of marketing it all together.

After an inspection of the 12 land banks made by a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, in which I went through each of the 12 banks very carefully, and also each of the intermediate credit banks, run in the same building and under the same officers, and concerning the problems which are revealed by the dealings of these banks with the farmers, I was very much gratified to find the efficiency with which the two institutions were meeting these three needs for capital.

First. As to capital loans for the ownership and improvement of farms, there are in round numbers \$10,000,000,000 of farm loans secured by mortgages of farms in the United States, and, it being figured that there are about \$40,000,000,000 invested in farms, it will be noted that there is 25 per cent in round numbers borrowed. Up to the time of the institution of the farm-loan system the rate of interest would average at least 8 per cent on all farm loans, or, in round numbers, \$800,000,000 per annum. Since the farm-loan banks entered the business, \$1,000,000,000 of loans in round numbers has been made by the farm-land banks and half a billion has been made by the joint-stock land banks. They have absorbed such a per cent of the business that they have compelled the land-mortgage companies and the insurance companies to meet their interest rates and to amortize their loans. The reduction in interest rates will average  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent over the whole United States, which means a saving in that item alone of \$250,000,000 annually. A farmer now can borrow \$1,000, have it amortized so that he will pay  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent per annum, being \$65 on the \$1,000, divided into two payments, one each six months, and by so doing and meeting simply that  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, at the end of 34½ years his debt, interest, and everything is paid. Under the old system he paid 8 per cent on the

average and thereby paid \$80 a year instead of \$65, and would pay that in the 34½ years and still be owing the \$1,000. He will then have paid \$517.50 more than he does under the land-bank system and yet will owe the \$1,000, whereas by paying the land bank \$517.50 less he will have paid both the interest and the debt. The money is obtained for these loans on the joint credit of all the farmers who are members of the farm-loan associations, pooled in the shape of notes and mortgages against which debenture bonds are sold, and sold readily at a little over par at a rate of interest now about  $4\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. The Government stock has been retired with the exception of \$1,331,930, while the farmers own \$52,000,000 of the stock. The bonds are absolutely gilt edge, no dead assets are carried in the statement of the banks, which shows them with surplus and reserve abundant to care for everything after charging off, as they do monthly, all real estate bought in under foreclosure and in the billion dollars of loans the real estate so bought is negligible and is resold without loss in the majority of instances. It is the best financial cooperative effort that has ever been organized, and is just reaching its stride now in service to the American farmer, whereby he is serving himself. Of the 365,000 loans made to farmers the average loan is \$3,100 in round numbers.

Second. As to the capital loans of a temporary nature, loans to stock farms with livestock, machinery, and so forth, the intermediate credit banks are being used, and they can make loans for that purpose and rediscount paper of agricultural credit corporations and of banks which have at least six months to run and not over three years, and where a man purchases a herd of cattle for purposes of production and will need at least three years to begin to put his product on the market these banks have been wonderfully helpful and remarkably successful, and some agricultural credit corporations procure from these institutions the funds for their members for producing their crops at a very low rate of interest and with remarkable results in reducing the cost of crops and increasing the profit of the farmers. Then, when a crop is made, for example, the cotton crop of the South, the marketing loan is necessary. Fifteen million bales of cotton marketed in one month would overwhelm the market of the world, and yet it is a scant supply for the needs of the world, and if marketed in an orderly way as the need develops and as the manufacturers call for it, there should be no demoralization in price. The intermediate credit banks furnish the marketing association with the money at a rate of interest which can not be had elsewhere for the orderly and systematic feeding of the crop to the market as it is needed, and thereby giving stability to the price of the product. In the matter of cotton manufacturing this is a wonderful help to the manufacturer and everybody concerned, because the price is comparatively stable and the manufacturer is not required to make enormous loans to acquire the cotton while it is being marketed at once, but he knows there is a reservoir where the cotton is sold where he can buy at a comparatively stable price as the needs arise. The money for these intermediate credit loans, covering the short-time capital loans, the production loans, and the marketing loans, is obtained by selling debentures of the intermediate credit banks against the notes of the farmers, which they have discounted, and is obtained at a rate of interest between 4 per cent and 5 per cent, and the rate to the farmer can not be more than  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent more than the money cost the bank.

A word about the intermediate credit banks. They have \$60,000,000 capital from the United States Treasury. They can sell debentures to ten times that amount. Thus each bank can have \$55,000,000 capital for the needs of its district. Not more than \$10,000,000 has been used by any bank, I think, at one time. They can rediscount farm paper for any bank in the district which has not less than six months nor more than three years to run. But the banks do not handle it, because they can not use paper where the rate charged was over 7 per cent, and they can not afford to break their rate to that. The way it is done is to organize agricultural associations, with good, solvent farmers and bankers as stockholders, and the banks take much of the stock, and this corporation takes the farmers' notes and rediscount the paper with the intermediate credit bank at  $5\frac{1}{4}$  to  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

Patience and conservatism on the part of all concerned I feel sure will develop these twin institutions into a system which will enable the farmer of America to become self-sustaining and make a living profit out of his activities. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].



Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, from the House floor on January 6, 1926, I mentioned that Mr. Leon L. Shield, of Coleman, Tex., who had demanded that I resign because I would not obey orders from the tax clubs, had himself resigned as cashier of his bank.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 6, 1926, showed just what I said. Certain newspapers got mixed up and erroneously reported that it was Lee Satterwhite who told me to resign.

Lee Satterwhite is a newspaper man. He is an old, experienced one. He knows just how many errors appear in press reports. He knew that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he could see just exactly what I had said. He has access to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Lee Satterwhite is the editor and publisher of the Panhandle Herald. Each day from Washington the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is mailed to Lee Satterwhite's newspaper. He has been closely watching the proceedings of Congress. As one of the spokesmen for the tax clubs he has had his expenses paid on his two recent trips to Washington. He sat in the gallery when the House debated the tax clubs. He could hardly have escaped notice of my former speech, wherein I first mentioned that Lee Shield had requested me to resign. If he had exercised ordinary judgment, he would have known that I was misquoted. But he seized upon this erroneous press report, and proceeded to take advantage of it. Instead of sending me a letter through the mails, which I would receive promptly, if he wanted to address me, he proceeded to print a letter covering two whole columns, and a part of a third, on the front page of his newspaper; the Panhandle Herald, published in Carson County—whose population the 1920 census gave as 3,078—addressed to me here in Washington. And a copy of it was finally brought to my attention.

And he proceeded to deny that he had asked me to resign, although I had made no such assertion, and to unjustly abuse me in his newspaper, as if he were addressing me in a letter. I quote from his paper the following:

At a little dinner party in Washington at which you and I were present and the repeal of the Federal inheritance tax was under discussion, you made the assertion that you did not believe the Federal inheritance tax would be removed. I replied in a spirit of levity, more than in earnestness, that perhaps Congress would not remove the tax, but perhaps some Congressmen could be removed. When that remark was made, I had no intention of exercising any effort to defeat you or any other Member of Congress, because we happen not to agree as to whether Congress should or should not levy an inheritance tax.

The dinner party he mentions was the one he helped to arrange and pull off in the oak room of the Raleigh Hotel. He presided over same as toastmaster. It was paid for by the tax clubs. Only four Congressmen attended. He called on me, and I frankly expressed my views that they were wasting time and money, as I felt sure they would not induce the House to repeal the inheritance or estate tax, and I gave my reasons. Congressman THOMAS, of Oklahoma, expressed views similar to my own. Congressman RAINEY, of Illinois, likewise expressed views unalterably opposed to a repeal of such tax. Although he was our presiding host, he could not conceal his displeasure, for in a fit of petulance Lee Satterwhite arose and exclaimed that—

We may not be able to get rid of the estate tax, but in Texas we will know how to get rid of some Congressmen.

And I immediately arose and told him that his remark was a discourtesy to his guests who conscientiously disagreed with him. And immediately his clubs, through his main officer, Mr. Colvin, began to attack me in the Texas press. His associate, Senator Stuart, was sent, with his expenses paid, to my district, and he spoke against me at Coleman, warning me of political opposition unless I obeyed orders, following which his club's secretary, Leon Shield, requested me to resign. And his clubs have filled the Texas press with articles attacking me, and the other 17 Congressmen from Texas, all of whom unanimously refused to repeal the estate tax.

Then, because he had been sued for a \$75 board bill, he sought to vent his spleen upon me by falsely asserting in his paper that I had twice borrowed \$100 in Wichita Falls. This is not true. I have never borrowed any sum from any person in Wichita Falls. No one there has ever made me any loan. There has never been a time during the past 25 years when I could not borrow from my home bank a thousand dollars on my note without interest. And during my service here I have been so situated that my bank here would loan me as much as \$1,000 at any time on my plain note without security.

I have at all times treated Lee Satterwhite with the utmost courtesy. I have never abused him. I have appreciated his splendid ability as a newspaper man in Texas. I have merely

defended myself against unjust attacks which he and his tax clubs have unjustly waged against me. Every reference I have ever made concerning him was in defense of unjust action he and his tax clubs had directed against me. Self-defense is always justifiable. The following discloses that erroneous press items have been incited in my district:

[From Austin American, issue of January 13, 1926]

BLANTON'S SEAT OBJECTIVE OF W. C. WOODWARD

THOMAS L. BLANTON, "economy watchdog" of Congress and unique campaigner of west Texas, will be tackled for his seat in the National House this year by State Senator Walter C. Woodward, of Coleman, colleagues of Senator Woodward disclosed here.

Senator Woodward, a consistent "Ferguson man," will inject a strong "administration" angle in this race by his entry, it is believed. He was leader in the senate for the Ferguson amnesty measure, and has been a supporter of the administration throughout the year of its term.

You will note that when the opposition selected a man to make the race against me they found him in Coleman, where lives this Mr. Leon Shield, secretary of Lee Satterwhite's tax clubs; and remember that Coleman is the place to which these tax clubs sent their Senator Stuart to speak against me; and it was from Coleman that the first warning came to me that if I "did not obey, I would have opposition of the deadly earnest kind"; and it was from Coleman that Mr. Leon Shield requested me to resign if I did not obey. But their selected candidate took a second thought, for I have just received the following:

CRITZ & WOODWARD, ATTORNEYS AT LAW,

Coleman, Tex., January 14, 1926.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Perhaps you have heretofore had your attention called to some unauthorized news items in the Texas press stating that I would be a candidate for Congress. Perhaps your attention has been called to the correction I have made of these reports, but, nevertheless, I am advising you that the reports were unauthorized by me and I am not a candidate for Congress; in fact, I have announced for reelection to the State senate, the position I now hold.

Yours very truly,

WALTER C. WOODWARD.

Mr. Chairman, I am here 2,000 miles from my district, laboring each day and some of each night in behalf of the people I represent, hoping to be of benefit to my country and my Government. Propagandists in Texas must not tell stories on me. I am going to force them to keep the record straight, and therefore it has been necessary for me to divert thus far from my main subject.

I have secured this time to reply to a tariff speech made yesterday by the Republican leader on high tariff rates, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER].

Since we resumed our labors here following the Christmas holidays, several Democrats have made speeches on the tariff, and have justly taken you Republicans to task concerning your many inexcusable, unconscionable high rates carried in your Fordney-McCumber bill. They have chastised you first on one part of your protective anatomy and then on the other. Consequently, you Republicans were sore all over. You have been hearing from the industrial workers in the cities, who have been carrying a part of the load. You have been hearing from the farmers and producers, who have been carrying most of the load, because they do not receive corresponding benefits. You were in a dilemma. These speeches had to be answered. They could not be answered by facts. What was most needed were skill, ingenuity, and detractive argument. In your emergency yesterday, you Republicans sent for the best debater you have on this floor, for he is really the only rough and tumble high-tariff debater you have left who can stand up and hold his own with the Democrats of this House. If you had not had available my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER], our Democratic thrusts would have gone unanswered. I want to say this about him. The gentleman holds his own in debate, but yet he comes from that part of the country which believes a man ought to be square with his opponent, and when I had much trouble with the Chairman here yesterday afternoon in getting my position clearly stated in the RECORD, I had no trouble with the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER]. He is a most worthy foe.

What is the correct Democratic position on the tariff so far as the farmer is concerned? Here are the facts. Every year now, through the customhouses, even Democrats will agree with the Republicans that we must collect \$500,000,000 of our revenue.



Mr. BLACK of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, what Democrat has advocated that? I have not heard any Democrat advocate that. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. How much does the gentleman say we ought to collect?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Oh, the gentleman knows I am against the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill and any such high rates as it imposes, but I do not know of any Democrat that advocates—

Mr. BLANTON. So am I unalterably against most of the Fordney-McCumber rates. But how much does the gentleman think ought to be collected each year through the customhouses?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am not stating any arbitrary figure.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, not arbitrarily, but reasonably and justly, how much does he say ought to be collected in that way? Do we have to collect any sum through the customhouses?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. This gentleman from Texas favors a Democratic tariff written for revenue only and not based upon such high rates as the Fordney tariff bill imposes.

Mr. BLANTON. How much of our needed revenue do we have to collect through the customhouses?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am not going to state any arbitrary figure. I would not undertake to set any such figure.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will agree we have to collect some amount, because the gentleman says he is for a tariff for revenue only, and that admits we must collect part of our revenue through the customhouses. Then, how much does he say that we should collect through that method? He will not say. Yet it is a problem that we Congressmen must decide. It is our duty to find out from the Budget estimates the full amount of money that is needed by our Government to run its business, and then, as statesmen, we must determine through what methods this money must be raised. And we must determine just how much of it must be raised by tariff rates collected through the customhouses.

The Underwood tariff bill was a so-called Democratic measure, because it was passed by Democrats under Democratic administration. Under this Democratic Underwood bill our Government collected between \$300,000,000 and \$400,000,000. When the expenses of our Government now are several hundred million dollars more than they were when the Underwood bill was passed, we may reasonably suppose that Democrats who agreed to the Underwood bill would now agree that much more revenue must now be collected through the customhouses than were collected by the Underwood bill. If with much lower expenses than Democrats agreed through the Underwood bill that between \$300,000,000 and \$400,000,000 must be collected in tariff rates through the customhouses, then at this time with expenses nearly doubled, will Democrats deny that we must collect as much as \$500,000,000 each year in tariff duties?

Other good Democrats have said that it is now necessary for us to collect as much as \$500,000,000 of our needed revenue each year through the customs houses. I am taking the word of Democrats who are willing to say how much in tariff duties we must collect. Then, it being admitted by most Democrats that we must so collect \$500,000,000 annually, then what is the problem? Upon what products are we going to distribute the \$500,000,000? Is all of it to be on the finished products of New England? Are the farmers to have no benefit whatever from a proper distribution? Their products will raise revenue just as well as the manufactured products of New England.

I will go my Texas friend [Mr. BLACK] one step further. I am for a tariff for revenue where it is needed, but I am likewise for a tariff that will maintain the American standard of living in the United States. [Applause.] That is as far as I will go. A tariff for revenue and one that will protect our American standard of living. My position on this subject has been consistent ever since I was a schoolboy. I had a joint debate in my State on that subject when I was 21 years of age, and I took that identical position and I have maintained it ever since.

Mr. friend from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown] did me a valuable service a moment ago. He handed me a document that I sent to my Democratic colleagues in 1920. That was before we framed the emergency tariff bill and it was before you framed the Fordney-McCumber bill. It was long before the bills had been in the making that I addressed this communication to my Democratic colleagues. It is dated December 4, 1920. Here is what I then said. I will read some extracts from it, because I want you to know that my position now is the position that I took then, and it has been my position through every campaign that I have made in Texas. It was

the position I took in my campaign and platform when I came to Congress from a Democratic district in Texas, as strong a Democratic district as exists in the United States. Now let me show you what I said to my Democratic colleagues then. I quote from this communication of mine dated December 4, 1920, the following:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 4, 1920.

MY DEAR SIR: Through wise counsel comes wisdom. Hoping to help solve a problem of momentous national importance, I am seeking light. May I ask that you aid in its solution? What would you suggest?

Time has proven that free raw material is not a fundamental of true democracy. It has been a fatal policy, and constitutes one of our gravest mistakes. It has almost bankrupted some of our southern producers, who by law have been forced to purchase everything they have to buy in a protected market and then sell all of their raised products in a free one, where the whole world, dissimilar as it is, competes on an equal footing. The elusive, seductive doctrine of permitting raw materials from every foreign country of the world to enter the United States absolutely free of duty has taken away from our home producers their home market and is largely responsible; for the chamber of commerce in Ranger, Tex., now offering some of the splendid farms of Eastland County rent free to any farmers who will agree to cultivate them next year; for our warehouses now bulging out with both the spring and fall clips of domestic wool, which can not now be sold for its cost of production; for the crippling of our great peanut industry; for stagnating our important stock-raising and dairy interests; and for swiftly depopulating our farms and ranches. Our farmers and stockmen of the United States, sturdy producers who yearly feed and clothe our 105,000,000 people, are now with their backs to the wall, facing a most serious crisis.

In Mexico, South America, Australia, Europe, Asia, and Africa there exists an entirely different state of conditions, a different standard of living, a different standard of working hours, a different standard of wages, a different standard of necessities, morals, intelligence, hopes, ambitions, and aspirations. Mexican peons are content to work for a miserable existence. Chinese and Japanese laborers are perfectly satisfied to work from 10 to 14 hours each day for less than 20 cents pay, to live on rice, to go almost naked, and to let the future take care of itself. Must our intelligent, ambitious, deserving men and women on the farms and ranches of the United States be longer placed on the same level by being forced to compete directly with the peons and slaves of the universe? I am one loyal Democrat who is not in favor of it.

I have had Hon. Thomas W. Page, chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, to assemble for me the following authentic statistics concerning recent importations. During the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1920, the following raw materials were imported from foreign countries into the United States absolutely free of any duty, to wit:

Cotton, 345,314,126 pounds.  
Corn, 10,229,249 bushels.  
Wheat, 4,744,712 bushels.  
Wheat flour, 157,896 barrels.  
Wool, 427,578,038 pounds.  
Beef and veal, 42,436,338 pounds.  
Mutton and lamb, 16,358,290 pounds.  
Cattle, 575,323 head.  
Sheep, 199,549 head.  
Cowhides, 439,461,092 pounds.  
Calf hides, 68,359,825 pounds.  
Cabretta hides, 101,848 pounds.  
Buffalo hides, 14,682,279 pounds.  
Other hides, 275,964,213 pounds.  
Oil cake, 145,026,652 pounds.  
Chinese nut oil, 10,613,638 gallons.  
Coconut oil, 269,226,966 pounds.  
Cottonseed oil, 24,164,821 pounds.  
Palm oil, 50,163,387 pounds.  
Palm kernel oil, 53,508 pounds.  
Olive oil, for manufacturing, 216,145 gallons.  
Soy-bean oil, 195,773,594 pounds.  
Other oils, \$1,542,271 worth.

During the recent four months of July, August, September, and October, 1920, the following raw materials were imported from foreign countries into the United States absolutely free:

Cotton, 42,961,691 pounds.  
Corn, 5,317,376 bushels.  
Wheat, 12,040,541 bushels.  
Wheat flour, 221,989 barrels.  
Wool, 44,435,246 pounds.  
Beef and veal, 19,456,961 pounds.  
Mutton and lambs, 64,623,776 pounds.  
Cattle, 142,139 head.  
Sheep, 94,960 head.



Cowhides, 80,023,847 pounds.  
 Calf hides, 10,782,491 pounds.  
 Cabretta hides, 488 pounds.  
 Buffalo hides, 3,270,450 pounds.  
 Other hides, 53,013,186 pounds.  
 Oil cake, 128,615,571 pounds.  
 Chinese nut oil, 3,354,901 gallons.  
 Coconut oil, 62,402,486 pounds.  
 Cottonseed oil, 579,172 pounds.  
 Palm oil, 12,962,010 pounds.  
 Palm-kernel oil, 1,403,651 pounds.  
 Olive oil, for manufacturing, 9,896 gallons.  
 Soy-bean oil, 26,923,725 pounds.  
 Other oils, \$378,053 worth.

It does not require an expert to realize just how much the above free competitive imports have discriminated against our farmers and stockmen, and their consequent losses thus occasioned, besides the great loss in revenue to the Government. We raise annually about 65,000,000 head of cattle, while South American countries with only a little more than a third of our population raise over 80,000,000 head of cattle yearly. Due to their tropical climate, cheap and luxuriant grass, cheap labor, ample water, and little feeding, our cost of production is about five times as great as theirs per pound.

The time has come when we must take products of American farms and ranches and all competitive substitutes off of the free list and let our American market afford a living wage and return to our producers, and when we must so arrange our tariff schedules on such products and substitutes as will equalize our cost of production with that of foreign countries. To a certain extent this principle was recognized and followed in the tariff act of October 3, 1913, in placing a duty on certain products largely raised by cheap labor in foreign countries. And during the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1920, the following dutiable products were imported from foreign countries into the United States and duty paid upon same, to wit:

Rice, uncleaned, 22,437,197 pounds, duty five-eighths cent.  
 Rice flour, 1,265,198 pounds, duty one-fourth cent.  
 Rice cleaned, 156,217,566 pounds, duty 1 cent.  
 Beet sugar, 1,219,834 pounds.  
 Cane sugar, 7,533,200,338 pounds.  
 Molasses, 154,670,200 gallons.  
 Peanuts, shelled, 120,344,425 pounds, duty three-fourths cent.  
 Peanuts, not shelled, 12,067,998 pounds, duty three-eighths cent.  
 Butterine and cocoa butter, 41,500 pounds.  
 Olive oil, edible, 6,812,596 gallons, duty 30 cents.  
 Linseed and flaxseed oil, 4,550,391 gallons, duty 10 cents.  
 Peanut oil, 22,064,363 gallons, duty 6 cents.  
 Rapeseed oil, 1,229,526 gallons, duty 6 cents.  
 Other dutiable oils, 1,432,695 gallons.  
 Certain wheat, 35,052 bushels, duty 10 cents.  
 Certain wheat flour, 1,160 barrels.

If it is Democratic and American to place a duty upon rice, peanuts, and cane products, then why not upon our corn, wheat, cotton, wool, hides, livestock, and Far Eastern vegetable oils and substitutes that daily compete with our farm and ranch products? And why beg the question any longer? Why not place a proper and adequate duty upon all such items to do some good?

The millions of city consumers who inhabit New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Washington, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and our other large cities, while demanding and getting their \$6, \$8, \$10, \$15, \$20, and \$25 for six to eight hours' work each day are constantly demanding that everything they eat and wear be furnished to them at the lowest minimum. They never give a serious thought to the subject of a living wage to the producer who feeds and clothes them. And I am afraid that it has been the clamoring of these millions of city consumers, whose votes are very much desired, which has caused free raw materials to be written into Democratic platforms. Much too long have we Democrats permitted rest-needing politicians to entwine into our platforms and policies some city vote-catching slogan, to the detriment of our producers. With blinking eyes we Democrats have sat by and let our brother Republicans pass their measures to place a duty upon pearl buttons, chemical glass, surgical instruments, tungsten, magnesite, and the numerous other products their rich millionaire friends are interested in, thus placing unneeded millions into the pockets of a few wealthy millionaires, and we have let our worthy producers appeal to us in vain.

The proper solution of this question more vitally concerns the consuming millions in cities than anyone else. For suppose our producers were to get tired and quit. There would be starvation in cities. When the manufacturer can't make a profit he shuts down and prevents loss. But after the producer prepares and plants his ground in the spring and arranges for the season growth of his flocks and herds there is no shutting down for him without losing his whole year's income. He must combat drought, floods, disease, grasshoppers, boll weevil, rust, depredations, plots of gamblers, and the score of other enemies that seem to combine for his destruction. Just now there is ample demand

for our products abroad, but want of funds and credit prevents a sale. At an enormous expense we have built a large merchant marine, so essential in bringing the markets of the world to our producers, and we must not let it stand for naught or slip out of our hands. We must find a safe way to assist worthy producers to obtain necessary credit. We must see to it that our producers are not forced off of their farms and ranches.

What suggestions have you to offer? This problem will soon be before Congress for solution. It must be solved properly. We must get out of ruts and meet the present. I would appreciate hearing from you.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, remember that it was on the 4th day of December, 1920, that I proposed the above to my colleagues, long before we began framing the emergency tariff bill and long before the Fordney-McCumber bill was framed. My position was: First determine just how much revenue we must collect from the customhouses, and then distribute a just proportion of it upon the products of the farms and ranches, so that the American standard of living may be maintained on farms and ranches as well as among the industrial workers in the cities. Then all of the farm boys would not be leaving the farms and going to the cities. A tariff on certain products of the ranches and farms will produce revenue. Then why do not we divide the benefits justly between the producers and industrial workers? And the duties thereafter placed on certain farm products and ranch products, as mentioned by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER], followed these suggestions I made to my colleagues as early as December 4, 1920.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I must yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Do I understand that the gentleman is defending and indorsing the rates in the Fordney-McCumber bill?

Mr. BLANTON. No; certainly not. I voted against it, and I will tell my friend why.

Mr. COLTON rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, let me finish with this question first, and then I will yield. I had to yield to my colleague from Texas because I jumped on him in one matter, and I have not jumped on the gentleman from Utah. I will tell you why I was against that Fordney-McCumber bill. They did not stop with arranging for revenue only in fixing the rates. They did not stop with maintaining the American standard of living. That meant merely an equalization of the cost of production. If they had, I would have gone with them, like my friend from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] did. I would have gone with the Republicans if they had stopped at that. But they sought to enrich manufacturers with rates that were several times larger than was necessary to equalize cost of production.

What is maintaining the American standard of living? It is a tariff rate that will equalize the cost of production in this country as against that in every foreign country. That is what a tariff to protect the American standard of living means, and you Republicans know it as well as I do, but you did not stop there; you Republicans put the rates up many times over and over beyond that, so that it becomes a protection to favored manufacturers who become rich because of the necessities of the poor people of America, who bear the burden. It is to the interest of every person that American standards should be maintained. You protected the industrialists in the cities, and you want to see their American standard of living maintained, but you forgot the American standard of living on the farm, and you forgot the American standard of living on the ranches of the country, where those who produce the food for the Nation must exist. I am for giving these worthy producers a look-in on this tariff question. I am for giving them a protection for their American standards of living.

Mr. COLTON rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I must yield to my friend from Utah. He is so persistent.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman gave a very vivid description of the full warehouses of raw materials in 1920. Will he state that that condition now obtains among the producers of his country?

Mr. BLANTON. Let me tell the gentleman this: That he might travel with me through his State and through Kansas, and through Texas—

Mr. COLTON. Do not forget Iowa.

Mr. BLANTON. And through Iowa, when cattle are dying, lots of them, and many times you could not get a man to skin them for the small amount you could sell the hides for.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman referred to wool.



Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I voted for the wool schedules in the emergency tariff bill because the rates equalized the cost of production in this as against that of foreign countries. [Applause on the Republican side.] I voted with you for a tariff on frozen meats, on frozen beef and mutton. Frozen beef and frozen mutton were coming in here by the hundreds of millions of pounds from South America and other countries, where peon labor produces it.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment, when I reply to the gentleman from Utah—where peon labor raises them, where they have luxuriant grass and plenty of water, where they do not have to feed them, where you can raise a cow for one-half of what you can in this country. They were bringing millions of pounds of frozen meats in here, and, naturally, I wanted to protect the producing ranchmen and farmers of this country, and I voted for the emergency tariff bill with you; but let me tell you where my friend from Kansas [Mr. TINCER] fell down. I asked him to show me a beneficial tariff on steers, and he said:

Oh, yes; I am going to show you. I have got you in a jackpot; you did not know there was a tariff on steers, but I am going to show you.

And he attempted to read the law to us, and he said:

Why, there is a tariff of 1½ cents on steers up to 1,000 pounds, and when you get over 1,000 pounds, it is 2 cents.

Did he not say that? It is in the Record. He said it yesterday in two different places on two different pages, and he said he was going to rub it in on me good because I did not know it. Now, he had a chance to revise and correct those remarks, and he did not do it.

Mr. TINCER. I never do.

Mr. BLANTON. He had a chance to look up to see whether he made any mistake. Mr. Chairman, the tariff on steers is not 1½ cents up to 1,000 pounds, it is 1½ cents up to 1,050 pounds. Why did not the gentleman give us the correct figures if he wanted to be accurate? If the gentleman wanted to condemn me for inaccuracy, why was not he accurate himself? I will tell you what is the matter. He has kind of lost interest in the farmer, because Tincer No. 1, that fine oil and gas well in Oklahoma, came in yesterday with a fine production, and whenever you let a fellow become an oil magnate and a gas magnate, with a natural gas flow of several hundred million cubic feet per minute, you will find that he forgets the farmers and forgets farms and ranches. Therefore, I forgive him—he is so fair in other things. How many steers are there now that can be shipped into this country? There are none in Mexico and few in Canada. You put a tariff on steers when it did not do the producer much good, because no one can pay freight on live cattle from South America. That is what I was trying to bring home to the gentleman from Kansas yesterday. From only two countries you can bring cattle into this country under a 1½ cent tariff up to 1,050 pounds, and those are Mexico and Canada, and there are none to bring from Mexico and few to bring from Canada. And we raise about 65,000,000 cattle here each year.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I must yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKEOWN. I wanted to ask the gentleman if the tariff has done so much good to the farmer why it is that the property of the farmer has gone down \$20,000,000,000 since 1920; since we have had such wonderful laws?

Mr. BLANTON. I will answer that in a moment, but I want first to attend to this single Republican debator on whom his whole party depends for its maintenance here in the House [Mr. TINCER]. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for that little 1½ cent tariff on cattle weighing up to 1,050 pounds. It has benefited the ranchmen a little bit, but not much, and I will tell you why. I am going to put the Tariff Commission's figures in as to the cost of shipping a steer from South America to this country. I have not the time to give you the figures now, but the Tariff Commission has prepared them for me today. They can not ship them from South America or from some country other than Canada or Mexico, because the cost is prohibitive.

You can not ship them alive, but you can ship them dead, and that is the reason I worked so hard here with some of you gentlemen in 1920 to get a proper tariff upon frozen meats. You did give them a little tariff on frozen meats, but you ought to have doubled it. And I feel that my preaching to you back in 1920 helped to cause you to place this tariff both on live cattle and on frozen meats, for there was no such tariff before I wrote that communication of December 4, 1920.

You ought to have doubled it. You can double and treble it several times and you will not equalize the cost of the production of a steer in this country as against the cost in South America. You could not do it. I know of ranchmen in the United States who during certain years of the war were millionaires, and they are not worth a dollar to-day because of the deflation that occurred after the war.

Why, you talk about shipping from Mexico. I want to ask my friend from Kansas [Mr. TINCER] how many cattle have been shipped from Mexico in the last few years. None. Why, Mexico has been depleted almost of cattle during the war, and we ship more cattle into Mexico than came from Mexico. He ought to know that. Mexico now is not half stocked. Lots of its pastures have no cattle on them. Our cattlemen have been going across the Rio Grande with their herds and grazing the grass that otherwise would not be used in Mexico. That is what I had in mind when I spoke to the gentleman yesterday, but the shortness of time would not allow me to make my position clear when he talked about these Haugen steers that came from Canada. The gentleman [Mr. TINCER] said they were feeder steers last fall. Some of you do not know the difference between feeder steers and finished steers. Feeder steers are steers that the farmers buy and put in their feed lots to finish. They feed them with their surplus corn and other feed. Feeder steers are much cheaper than the finished product. Oh, he said that feeder steers Brother HAUGEN found out he could get for 8¼ cents, or how much was it?

Mr. TINCER. Eight at Kansas City and 8.25 to 9 at Chicago.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what he said.

Mr. TINCER. That is true; that is the fact.

Mr. BLANTON. Now let me tell you about that. He cited the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] as an authority. And he is, on cattle. If you will ask Mr. HUDSPETH he will tell you that at that time he had some fat steers, not feeders, but fat steers ready for the market, and he shipped them there and got 6 cents; that was all he got there, and some went for 5½ cents a pound. Ask my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], who is a cattleman—ask him what he got for his finished steers on the market at that time. Six cents was the highest and 5½ he got for part of them.

Mr. COLE. What time was it?

Mr. BLANTON. Last fall when he said these Haugen steers were brought across and he found out they were bringing 8¼ cents per pound or something like that. I will get the exact figures. I will find it in just a minute.

Mr. COLE. Seven and seventy one-hundredths he said he paid.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to quote it exactly. He says "he found that at Kansas City where your cattle were shipped steers weighing around 800 pounds." That is small size. You do not find any steers from Brother HUDSPETH's district going to market weighing 800 pounds. You do not find any steers from my country going to market weighing 800 pounds.

Mr. COLE. Feeders.

Mr. BLANTON. He was talking about sure-enough steers. The steers that Mr. HUDSPETH shipped were not feeders; they were finished fat and ready for slaughter and were slaughtered, and they sold for 5½ to 6 cents. Brother TINCER says, "he found that at Kansas City where your cattle were shipped steers weighing around 800 pounds were selling for 8¼ cents a pound." The market will not support you.

Mr. TINCER. Yes; it will.

Mr. BLANTON. Here is your witness [Mr. HUDSPETH], and I can prove it by him. Here is another witness, CHARLEY CARTER, who sold them, and I can prove it by him. The gentleman can not do it. It will not hold out. Now here is the proposition in a nutshell.

Mr. TINCER. The gentleman does not believe Mr. HAUGEN would have bought steers from a quarantine division to feed—

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman made a mistake.

Mr. TINCER. The gentleman did that yesterday, and he is mistaken again to-day.

Mr. BLANTON. He spoke of a 1½ cents a pound tariff up to 1,000 pounds when it was 1,050 pounds. The gentleman made a mistake and could be mistaken again. Usually he is very accurate for a full-back debater. He is your Republican full back. He is your emergency debater you send for when you need help. When the distinguished Speaker hears in the Speaker's rooms that the Republican Party is in trouble on the tariff and he has not any reply—he usually has a reply on most subjects, but he has not any—and the distinguished floor leader from Connecticut is without an answer, they send for the distinguished Kansan [Mr. TINCER] to come over here to answer, and he is the best they have got.



Mr. TINCHER. And pretty good, too. [Applause.]  
Mr. BLANTON. But he is mistaken sometimes. Now, let me tell you what is the matter—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Give me two minutes additional.

Mr. AYRES. I yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. If you want to help the Kansas farmer and Kansas stockmen, why do not you put a tariff of at least \$5 on hides? I am ready to vote that on here, and in the emergency tariff bill we Democrats voted that and forced you to put a duty on hides, but when you got back in the House, because we would not give an undue advantage to the New England manufacturers in a compensatory tariff on the finished product when shoes were then selling at \$12 to \$16 a pair you immediately took the tariff off of hides.

But you hurt every farmer in Kansas, and you hurt every farmer in Iowa, and you hurt every farmer in Texas when you refused to give him a tariff on hides. Now, if you want to equalize the cost of production between here and South America, where they have peon labor; if you do not want to put the stockmen of this country on an equality with the peons of South America, for God's sake change that and give us a tariff on hides. I am one Democrat who will vote with you on it. [Applause.] If you will revise the Fordney-McCumber bill and reduce every duty in it down to a rate that equalizes the difference between the cost of production in this and every foreign country in the world, I will vote with you.

When every country in the world was represented here in this Hall recently, during the Interparliamentary Union, and they brought up a free-trade movement on this floor, I was the one American who got up here and spoke against it and told them I was in favor of upholding the American standard of living and I was in favor of protecting same with tariff rates covering the difference in the cost of production here and that in every foreign country. [Applause.]

I promised that I would put into the RECORD some statistics which I have had the United States Tariff Commission prepare for me to-day. Note the following:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,  
Washington, January 19, 1926.

Hon. THOS. L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: In compliance with your request by telephone this date, there are inclosed herewith tables showing imports and exports of live cattle, of frozen meat, and of hides during the years 1924 and 1925.

This material has been assembled hurriedly and it is hoped that it may prove to be what you have in mind.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. BETHUNE,  
Secretary.

Live cattle and sheep imported into the United States during 1924 and during 11 months of 1925

[Calendar years]

Imported from—	1924	1925 (11 months)
<b>CATTLE (FREE)</b>		
England.....	Number 508	Number
Canada.....	612	
Mexico.....	92	
Virgin Islands.....	50	
Total.....	1,262	1,360
<b>CATTLE (DUTIABLE)</b>		
England.....	16	
Canada.....	130,590	
Mexico.....	11,275	
Virgin Islands.....	1,185	
All other.....	104	
Total.....	143,170	152,710
<b>SHEEP (DUTIABLE)</b>		
Mexico.....	11,758	
Canada.....	18,626	
Total.....	30,384	53,611

<sup>1</sup> Free—included in total.

You will note from the above data furnished by the United States Tariff Commission, that in 1924 there were 1,262 head of cattle imported into the United States absolutely free of

duty, and that during the first 11 months of 1925 there were 1,360 head of cattle imported into the United States absolutely free of duty.

Also note that during the year 1924 there were only a total of 143,170 head of dutiable cattle imported from all countries into the United States, and of this number 1,185 of same paid no duty. When we remember that we raise each year in the United States about 65,000,000 head of cattle it will be readily seen that these imports have very little effect upon the price of beef.

Now note that in spite of the fact that the United States each year raises about 65,000,000 cattle, and that in spite of our little tariff rate of 3 cents per pound on frozen beef and veal and 2½ cents per pound on frozen mutton, the following statistics furnished by the United States Tariff Commission show that quite a lot of frozen meats are brought from foreign countries into the United States:

Frozen meats imported into the United States  
[Calendar years]

Imported from—	1924		1925 (11 months)	
	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars
<b>BEEF, FRESH (DUTIABLE)</b>				
Canada.....	5,797,732	651,837		
Mexico.....	803	131		
Argentina.....	3,758,836	328,748		
Uruguay.....	404,467	44,177		
Australia.....	195,836	10,721		
New Zealand.....	3,357,474	194,695		
All other.....	21,842	3,610		
Total.....	13,537,010	1,233,919	10,631,696	1,097,334
<b>VEAL, FRESH (DUTIABLE)</b>				
Canada.....	3,777,261	542,162		
Argentina.....	5,956	889		
Uruguay.....	1,366	123		
Australia.....	152,568	11,598		
New Zealand.....	630,317	43,851		
Total.....	4,567,468	598,623	3,621,936	488,234
<b>MUTTON, FRESH (DUTIABLE)</b>				
Canada.....	50,440	8,710		
Argentina.....	643,953	58,245		
Uruguay.....	291,212	24,803		
Australia.....	3,722	412		
New Zealand.....	51,490	4,970		
Total.....	1,039,917	97,140	182,819	23,483
<b>LAMB, FRESH (DUTIABLE)</b>				
Canada.....	127,123	\$30,032		
Argentina.....	580,878	72,842		
Australia.....	103,256	13,682		
New Zealand.....	314,838	44,838		
All other.....	75	22		
Total.....	1,126,170	161,416	2,363,160	540,488

And it is interesting to note from the statistics furnished by the United States Tariff Commission the number of free hides that were imported into the United States from foreign countries during 1924 and the first 11 months of 1925 in free competition with all hides raised by our farmers and stockmen:

Free hides imported into the United States  
[Calendar years]

Imported from—	1924			1925 (11 months)		
	Pieces	Pounds	Dollars	Pieces	Pounds	Dollars
<b>CATTLE HIDES, DRY OR DRY SALTED (FREE)</b>						
Belgium.....	10,655	238,064	42,455			
France.....	13,797	279,065	65,167			
Canada.....	68,909	1,420,685	151,462			
Nicaragua.....	21,813	461,849	75,758			
Mexico.....	14,268	320,094	39,629			
Argentina.....	54,491	1,074,201	133,872			
Brazil.....	10,675	259,517	37,738			
Colombia.....	229,290	6,698,951	955,732			
Venezuela.....	70,648	1,926,582	275,205			
Australia.....	16,477	420,008	54,719			
All other.....	67,809	1,363,613	232,107			
Total.....	587,832	13,462,629	2,063,841	766,912	16,069,035	3,128,894



## Free hides imported into the United States—Continued

Imported from—	1924			1925 (11 months)		
	Pieces	Pounds	Dollars	Pieces	Pounds	Dollars
<b>CATTLE HIDES, WET SALTED (FREE)</b>						
France	59,066	3,994,538	618,312			
England	10,065	498,690	76,833			
Canada	714,881	33,543,588	3,451,083			
Panama	20,804	1,099,985	118,573			
Mexico	35,259	1,640,924	150,009			
Cuba	95,438	4,631,354	582,954			
Argentina	1,968,059	105,717,211	14,458,535			
Brazil	21,479	1,200,140	111,381			
Chile	14,706	802,868	79,586			
Colombia	19,482	815,393	96,526			
Uruguay	203,450	11,799,845	1,640,337			
Australia	47,446	1,779,471	192,883			
New Zealand	27,017	1,065,919	113,068			
All other	59,251	3,562,617	550,363			
Total	3,294,403	172,151,543	22,240,474	2,785,952	139,055,998	21,824,247
<b>CALFSKINS, DRY OR DRY SALTED (FREE)</b>						
Denmark	90,870	330,103	135,462			
Finland	480,023	1,212,761	625,315			
Latvia	369,514	1,023,610	523,991			
Netherlands	189,162	698,428	296,365			
Norway	192,882	617,474	300,340			
Poland and Danzig	65,570	353,517	85,270			
England	80,712	177,997	55,066			
Canada	164,267	841,246	193,217			
Argentina	405,760	1,222,443	293,887			
Uruguay	77,396	257,096	57,403			
New Zealand	203,473	978,600	271,220			
British South Africa	62,580	221,463	35,656			
All other	515,608	1,733,416	646,554			
Total	2,897,517	9,668,154	3,519,746	2,029,187	6,292,301	2,906,256
<b>CALFSKINS, WET SALTED (FREE)</b>						
Denmark	143,136	1,004,938	237,845			
Finland	70,000	449,575	104,897			
France	429,656	4,128,634	1,249,381			
Latvia	216,388	1,294,176	315,293			
Lithuania	136,142	718,763	187,340			
Netherlands	93,615	717,187	173,025			
Poland and Danzig	221,203	1,384,954	298,835			
Sweden	199,862	1,728,081	436,805			
Switzerland	75,866	777,760	244,301			
Canada	749,515	5,791,930	1,117,860			
Argentina	101,938	669,763	117,060			
Australia	71,105	356,936	81,046			
New Zealand	174,389	875,505	235,331			
All other	299,644	2,393,405	579,365			
Total	2,982,459	22,291,557	5,378,391	2,263,879	16,838,514	4,390,856

When it is a fact that our farmers and cattlemen have not been able to sell their hides for much more than it costs them to skin their cattle, yet foreigners, who raise them in other countries with peon labor, are able to ship them here across the water and sell them in free competition with our producers, it does seem to me that both Republicans and Democrats should agree that we must place a tariff duty on foreign hides.

When I have the time I intend to look up a splendid speech which my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. BLACK] made from this House floor deprecating the fact that the producers in his district could not get enough for their hides to pay for skinning the animal. It is worth preserving in the present RECORD. There is no Member in this House more valuable to the Government than my colleague from Texas [Mr. BLACK], and my disagreement with him on one phase of the tariff question is not to be deemed a criticism of him. We are both sincere, and merely view the question from different angles. Let me say in conclusion that unless we show the same consideration for the farmers and stockmen of the United States that we do for the manufacturer of the finished articles, and that we do for the industrial workers in the cities, our farms are going to be depopulated, for our farm boys are all going to quit and move to the cities, and then the city consumers will starve to death. We must give the American producers a square deal.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, men can be mistaken, and I do not believe it does a man any good to deny that he is mistaken. I do not remember whether I forgot that the rate was changed half a cent or

2 cents at a thousand yesterday. I was somewhat afraid that I had made a mistake, but I did not want to change it; I thought if I said a thousand when it should have been one thousand and fifty I would be criticized. In the main I believe every Member of Congress tries to be accurate.

But the gentleman claimed—the gentleman representing a great cattle district—that there was not a duty on cattle. He was mistaken. Why in the mischief did he not admit that he was mistaken? I remember when he made those remarks that he referred to. It was right after the election. The truth was in that statement. We had had eight years of the Underwood tariff law, and this country, so far as agriculture was concerned, was never at a lower ebb. And you voted with us, enough of you, to pass the Young emergency tariff law.

What happened? Why did you back up and vote against the Fordney-McCumber tariff law? I know a distinguished gentleman from your State, a man whose ability and learning no one will question, JACK GARNER, now the ranking member of the minority on the Committee on Ways and Means, who stood up on this floor, confronted with the facts as the facts existed after eight years under the Underwood law, and made the best protective-tariff speech that was ever made in this House. He mentioned the things the gentleman referred to in the circular. When the Republicans came to write a real tariff law, the Fordney-McCumber law, along the same line as the emergency tariff law, you caucused. You caucused to select a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the contest was between men like you and men like Mr. BLACK—I believe you were together in it—men with divided opinions, like you, on the tariff. Colonel HAYDEN was a candidate from the West on the Committee on Ways and Means, and the gentleman from New York, the Tammany leader in this House, was the other candidate.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, a western Democrat, adhering to the principles on the tariff you now advocate, fought for HAYDEN. HAYDEN was defeated in your caucus, and the policy of the Democratic Party from that day on was dictated by our distinguished and learned friend, a man we all admired, the lamented Mr. Kitchin. He said Mr. GARNER must not only not make another such tariff speech, but he must not put into the RECORD the one he made, and you changed your policy in the matter of the Fordney-McCumber tariff law, and you did not admit it in the circular that you disseminated through the country.

Mr. BLANTON. That relieved me of any responsibility to the caucus for my action in that campaign and in subsequent campaigns.

Mr. TINCHER. That is giving a little more detail. You bolted the caucus and walked out.

Mr. BLANTON. The Democratic caucus does not bind a man against his will under such circumstances.

Mr. TINCHER. Well, with that amendment to my statement as to what happened in that caucus I am willing that it stand in the RECORD exactly that way. You were relieved but you did not avail yourself of the relief, because you finally voted against the permanent tariff law after having voted for the temporary law.

Now, I do not want to be placed in the attitude with the House or the country of giving figures that are not accurate. I would not have given figures as to the transactions of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] unless I knew they were accurate. I not only obtained the figures from Mr. HAUGEN himself, but I had his statement about them. You know what I am talking about.

I do not want to stand here and tell you about my private affairs, but if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] had any live steers in the Kansas City market last fall, at the time Mr. HAUGEN was buying his feeders, which were sold for 6 cents, it was because they could not be sold as feeders and had to go to the packers. A feeder is a steer which can go to either, generally, because I had them there and know conditions there. I had steers there from the great State of Texas that weighed 850 pounds, and they brought 8½ cents in the Kansas City market. I do not have to go to you for facts with reference to them, because I know what the Kansas City market was.

You have always assumed to make it appear that I do not want to do something to assist agriculture. I have told you in private conversation that until I brought in this oil well that I am going home to see about, my family and I had no other interest in the world except agriculture.

You keep talking about a tariff on hides and think you can stir up something. However, you are right about it.

It ought to be put on. [Applause.] I am glad you voted for it, and with your fellows over there and with a little good



luck over here we might have gotten it on. But I did not know at the time you were making your fight for a tariff on hides that you had overlooked the fact that we had a tariff on the animal for twice as much. You say that does not do any good, but there is not another man in the House who represents an agricultural district but who will admit that if you put a tariff on the frozen meat and leave it off of the live animal they will bring in the live animal, but if you leave it off of the frozen meat and put it on the live animal they will bring in the frozen meat.

I am glad you have changed. I was gone for two weeks, and you were making speeches all the time in favor of reducing the tariff, but to-day your speech is in favor of raising it. I am glad we have made some converts. I am going home again to see if there is anything to your talk about this oil well, and when I come back I will be willing to hold another meeting and baptize all those who have been converted, as has the gentleman from Texas, on the subject of the tariff. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Here is another one. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I just want the gentleman to state whom he means by "you." The gentleman does not refer to all of us?

Mr. TINCHER. I mean BLANTON, and since the gentleman wants to be in, I will include him. The gentleman made a speech while I was away, and he put all the blame on the tariff. He said there was a terrible condition that existed in agriculture. That was a general speech and the gentleman did not give any figures, and I question the truth of some of the gentleman's statements. Does the gentleman want a revision of the tariff upward or downward?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I want to reduce it downward.

Mr. TINCHER. On cattle?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. On everything.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman wants the tariff revised downward on cattle?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I am in favor of a tariff for revenue only, if the gentleman wants me to state my position. Of course, the tariff on cattle is a tariff for revenue, because the gentleman says we are importing them.

Mr. TINCHER. But we are keeping most of them out. You take that tariff off and if, as a producer of livestock, you say it will not reduce the price of every hoof in America, you will stand alone.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Oh, no; I will not stand alone.

Mr. TINCHER. You will not say that to a cattleman's convention out in Nebraska. [Laughter.]

There is nothing in the world I love better than a debate on the tariff. I am a little like BLANTON. It is the first thing I ever learned to debate on. I am glad the Democrats have announced their policy is going to be to make the tariff the issue in the next campaign, and so long as half of them are in favor of raising the rates and the other half in favor of lowering them, I think we are sitting rather pretty on this side of the House. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG].

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I take this opportunity of calling attention to a bill I have introduced, which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture, which proposes the establishment of a Federal market-finding board to assist in the domestic and foreign marketing of agricultural commodities and in the disposition of surplus agricultural products, the same to be set up as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government.

The establishment of such a board simply seeks to provide for agriculture what every other business and industry has, to wit, a plan for the disposal of the surplus that drugs and depresses market prices and which the farmers, because of the multiplicity of their individual units, do not have; and since agriculture is the Nation's basic industry on which our prosperity rests, I believe that the Government should set up such an agency.

The bill provides that such a board shall be composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and five members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to be made with due regard to the knowledge and experience of an appointee in (1) the production and marketing of livestock, (2) the production and marketing of grain, (3) the production and marketing of dairy and poultry products, (4) the production and marketing of cotton and tobacco, and (5) the production and marketing of fruits and vegetables.

In addition to the usual powers given such an independent agency, its duties shall be to acquire from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, or any other department or agency of the United States, State, Territory, or possession of the United States, information with respect to—

The existence of a surplus of any agricultural commodity.

The domestic and foreign markets for such commodity.

The prices, or the probable trend of the prices, of such commodity in the markets.

The process of manufacturing, packing, and new uses of agricultural products.

The transportation facilities to and the handling, storing, and other facilities in such markets.

The board shall publish and shall furnish upon request to any producer of such commodity, any cooperative association or other organization of such producers, or any person owning or controlling such commodity, its recommendation upon the disposition of such commodity, and the available methods of financing.

The United States shall assume no liability, directly or indirectly, arising out of the execution by the board of any of its functions.

The salaries of the board, together with a secretary, experts and employees, offices and expenses to be paid by the Government.

I believe that such a board with the powers given it would be able to determine the surpluses of agricultural products in any part of the country and assist the owners of the same in finding the best market therefor, and wherever such information disclosed a surplus beyond the needs of the whole Nation, that through the Department of Commerce with its commercial agents throughout the world and other sources, it could assist the owners of such products in the exporting and marketing of the same and, if financing was necessary, could advise how the same could best be secured through either our commercial or intermediate credit banking system.

I also believe that with the experience that would come to such a board they would be in a position to recommend any sound, helpful legislation that might be necessary and secure the passage of the same through Congress.

I realize that with the present demand for "price fixing" and the "purchase of surpluses" by the Government or by a tax on agricultural products that my bill may not meet with approval, since it only provides for an organization to do for agriculture what other industries are able to do for themselves. But I have introduced the same to have a record of what I believe to be a sound, businesslike plan to market surplus agricultural products. I expect to vote for all legislation which the Committee on Agriculture, after due deliberation, favorably reports for passage to the House, and I hope they may be able to form and agree on legislation acceptable to agricultural interests, but should the representatives of agricultural interests fail to agree, or either the provisions of the Constitution or the impossibility of passage through Congress stand in the way of legislation now being proposed, I urge consideration of the plan suggested in my bill.

The bill is as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
January 18, 1926.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 7908) to establish a Federal market-finding board to assist in the domestic and foreign marketing of agricultural commodities and in the disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Federal marketing act of 1926.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government a board, to be known as the Federal market-finding board (hereinafter referred to as the "board"), and to be composed of (1) the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce, and (2) five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The terms of office of the appointed members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President, one at the end of the second year, one at the end of the fourth year, one at the end of the sixth year, one at the end of the eighth year, and one at the end of the tenth year after the date of the enactment of this act. The terms of office of all successors shall expire 10 years after the expiration of the terms for which their predecessors were appointed, but any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor.

(c) The board shall annually designate an appointed member to act as chairman of the board.



(d) Any member in office at the expiration of the term for which he was appointed may continue in office until his successor takes office.

(e) Vacancies in the board shall not impair the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the board, and a majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the board.

(f) Each of the appointed members shall be a citizen of the United States, shall not actively engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as member of the board, and shall receive a salary of \$10,000 a year, together with actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while away from the principal office of the board on business required by this act.

(g) The appointment of the members shall be made with due regard to the knowledge and experience of (1) one appointee in the production and marketing of livestock, (2) one in the production and marketing of grain, (3) one in the production and marketing of dairy and poultry products, (4) one in the production and marketing of cotton and tobacco, and (5) one in the production and marketing of fruits and vegetables.

#### GENERAL POWERS OF BOARD

##### SEC. 3. The board—

- (a) Shall maintain its principal office in the District of Columbia.
- (b) Shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.
- (c) Shall make an annual report to the Congress.
- (d) May make such regulations as are necessary to execute the functions vested in it by this act.

(e) May (1) appoint a secretary and such experts and, subject to the provisions of the civil service laws, such other officers and employees, and (2) in accordance with the classification act of 1923, fix the salaries of such secretary, experts, officers, and employees, and (3) make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal service at the seat of government and elsewhere, for law books, periodicals, and books of reference, and for printing and binding), as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in the board and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time. All expenditures of the board shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman.

#### SPECIAL POWERS AND DUTIES

SEC. 4. (a) The board shall acquire, from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, or any other executive department, independent establishment, or agency of the United States, any State, any Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, and analyze information in respect of—

- (1) The existence or the possibility of the existence of a surplus of any agricultural commodity produced within the United States.
  - (2) The domestic and foreign markets for such commodity.
  - (3) The prices, or the probable trend of the prices, of such commodity in such markets.
  - (4) The process of manufacturing, packing, and new uses of agricultural products.
  - (5) The transportation facilities to, and the handling, storing, and other facilities in, such markets.
- (b) The board shall publish and shall furnish, upon request, to any producer of such commodity, any cooperative association or other organization of such producers, or any person owning or controlling any of such commodity, its recommendations upon the disposition of such commodity and the available methods of financing.
- (c) The United States shall assume no liability, directly or indirectly, arising out of the execution by the board of any of its functions under this act.

#### COOPERATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the duty of any governmental establishment in the executive branch of the Government, upon request by the board, or upon Executive order, to cooperate with and render assistance to the board in carrying out the provisions of this act. The board may, in cooperation with any such governmental establishment, avail itself of the services and facilities of such governmental establishment in order to avoid preventable expense or duplication of effort.

(b) The board may cooperate with any State or Territory, or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or with any person.

#### APPROPRIATION

SEC. 6. For expenses in the administration of the functions vested in the board by this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200,000, to be available to the board for such expenses (including salaries and expenses of the members) incurred prior to July 1, 1927.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. HARE. I would like to ask the gentleman for information whether or not the purposes of his bill are embodied in the act creating the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I think not. This is to be an independent organization set up for the purpose of handling this as an independent matter and learning where the surplus products of agriculture are and where a market can be found for them.

Mr. HARE. I had the impression the same idea was embodied in the act creating the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and I asked for information.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I think not. If so, the authority has not been used.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY].

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, to-day is the one hundred and nineteenth anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee. Five years ago I began here the agitation of the proposition to restore his mansion at Arlington and maintain it to his memory. A year ago Congress went far toward the execution of that plan by passing the resolution so generously proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Arlington is a place sacred to the Nation. To us of the South it is a place of peculiar consequence and peculiar sorrow. Linked with it indelibly in our minds and hearts is the name and silent glory of Robert E. Lee, "the most stainless of earthly commanders, and, save in fortune, the greatest." A man who in the words of Ben Hill, of Georgia, was—

Cæsar without his ambition, Frederick without his tyranny, Napoleon without the selfishness, and Washington without his reward.

Twenty-five years ago I came to Washington, as people occasionally do, with a party of sightseers, about a hundred people, all of them southerners. Most of them were on their first visit to the National Capital. I noted with grief, and yet with approval, their expressions that in and around the splendid residence of Robert E. Lee there was not one thing to remind us by atmosphere that this was once his home. There mingled into our party a stalwart New Englander, who had come to visit the grave of his father. As he heard these expressions from my southern friends, he quietly remarked, "I don't blame them. I should feel that way myself."

From that day to this I have had a growing conviction that this thing ought to be changed, and that one day it would be changed. "His enemies themselves being judges," Lee stands as one of the purest and gentlest and at the same time one of the most brilliant and heroic men in American history.

An editor of a great New York magazine referred to him recently as the most splendid and heroic character of the Civil War, and said, "I am glad to have the columns of this magazine used to honor his name." When I spoke from this floor on this subject some three or four years ago, the lamented Congressman Osborne, from California, was the only Union veteran in the House. He wrote me a letter of cordial appreciation and assured me he considered it a privilege to join in such a cause.

Since the Cramton resolution was passed a year ago there have been published a few bitter and hurtful expressions against it. But, of course, we must expect some lingering bitterness after so terrible a conflict. The more is the obligation of the generous on both sides to carry on. And it is gratifying to observe that not one of the discordant notes, in so far as I have been able to observe, has come from a Member of this House. Hence I expect with confidence the passage of legislation to put the Cramton resolution into effect.

I need not argue other reasons. They are obvious. The loyalty of the South is established, sealed with the blood of her sons. Before the secession she had given largely to the building of the Nation. Since the reunion she has given just as generously. I would not say that she has come back to the Union conquered, because in her attitude toward the Government she has exhibited none of the animus of defeat. I do not know another case in history where a people have mastered themselves with the strength and poise of their own character as hers have. On other continents such a situation as existed at the close of the Civil War in this country would have been the breeding of a score of wars and provincial hatreds to a dozen generations. The South has come back with head erect and eyes unafraid, having fought to her last energy for a principle which she considered vital, but accepting the issue of battle with good grace and honest courage.

We each fought as Americans for what we believed to be American rights, and the valor of both sides is a heritage to all Americans. If brotherhood does exist in our hearts it is certainly reasonable to expect that it be given material expression, and that we make haste to remove such material conditions as exist in contradiction of it.

May I make this suggestion? What would have been the reaction in the minds and hearts of most of the gentlemen here



had the South opposed the erection of the Grant or the Lincoln Memorial? We do not propose the erection of a memorial. We simply ask the preservation of one.

We of the South have been called on to pay tribute to the valor of the North, and gladly we have paid it. As worthy foemen we have honored the soldiers in blue; as honest foemen we have respected them; as reunited brethren we have worked with them; as comrades in arms our sons have shed blood under a common flag with theirs through two wars in a common cause. For more than half a century our money has been added to theirs to pension the veterans of the Grand Army, against which we fought; to buy, beautify, and maintain Federal cemeteries from Gettysburg to Vicksburg; to erect monuments to Federal leaders.

Not many months ago we heard a southern Democrat on this floor speak of General Grant, "who was as generous as he was brave," and we have witnessed under the very shadow of the Capitol the unveiling of the Grant Memorial, where the most striking tribute paid to the Union commander came from the commander of the Confederate Veterans.

Why should it not be so? Men who are gallant enough to fight as these men fought are usually generous enough to do each other justice after the fight is over. This is typical of the spirit of the Nation. The great objective to which we all are now striving is world peace, and the eyes of the world are turned on America for leadership. If we are to lead the world in peace, we must be at peace among ourselves.

And truly we find this spirit of generosity on both sides of the line. The lamented and great-souled President Harding said a few short months before his death, "There is no longer any sign of conflict, we are united in the sweetest concord that ever united men."

And Secretary Denby said publicly in a southern city, "I am a northerner, but first I am an American. You can not take from me my pride in Lee and Jackson and Pickett, and your own immortal Forrest."

This is nobly spoken, and if its leaders can speak thus, can not the Nation? Then let the names of Lee, of Jackson, of Stuart, of Forrest, and of Semmes take their rightful places beside those of Grant, Thomas, Sheridan, Sherman, and Faragut. Is it reasonable to deny this simply because they lived south of the Mason-Dixon line? Simply because in a national division they took their places against the Government that kept its seat at Washington? Are there no precedents? Have we forgotten that the body of Cromwell was hanged at Tyburn, and that to-day the kingdom is filled with statues and memorials to him, erected by loyal subjects of a government that bears the name of that against which he fought? Is there not echoing in our ears even now the voice of a Briton declaring the rebel Washington to be "our greatest Englishman"?

Let us teach the children of the Nation that American valor is American valor wherever found. Let the gates of the cemetery and of the amphitheater bear the whole story. Let the home of Lee, as the home of Washington, be held sacred, kept in its original beauty, the treasure of a reunited people.

Then, indeed, we will dwell together in the sweetest concord that ever united men. Then, indeed, will we not be northerners or southerners but Americans. Then, indeed, will the blood of our young men at San Juan Hill, at Belleau Wood, and in the Argonne, shed under a common flag and in a common cause, have sealed our hearts with a bond eternal.

And our children's children will look with joy on the great memorial bridge spanning the Potomac, uniting the North and the South, connecting the great highways—the Lee and the Lincoln—by which the people of the Nation shall visit together, know and love each other better, and trust each other more.

And one end of the great span shall open upon the Nation's majestic memorial to Lincoln, the other upon sacred Arlington, the resting place of valiant Americans, whether they wore the blue, the gray, or the khaki, and the home of America's spotless Christian warrior, patriot, and hero, Robert Edward Lee.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD].

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am sorry my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER] is not here. The gentleman has been talking a good deal about the tariff question for the last day or two and has been trying to convince the House and the country that the Fordney-McCumber tariff law is very beneficial to the farmers of America. When Mr. TINCER or anyone else makes that statement he comes in direct conflict with some of the out-

standing Republican leaders in America. In other words, he gets into a debate with the junior Senator from his own State. Senator CAPPER only a few days ago made a speech at Boston in which he said that the farmers of America, under the present tariff law, get the hot end of the bargain; that the farmer is not protected, but, on the contrary, is flimflammed by the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER] also said that the stock raisers of America were greatly benefited by a tariff of 1½ cents a pound on livestock weighing up to 1,050 pounds and 2 cents a pound on cattle weighing more than 1,050 pounds, and the gentleman undertook to submit proof that 154,000 head of cattle were shipped into the United States last year. There are 64,000,000 head of cattle in the United States, my friends. In other words, the imports of cattle from Mexico and from Canada were one-fiftieth of 1 per cent of the production of cattle in the United States. I do not believe there is an intelligent man in America or elsewhere who will say that an importation of one-fiftieth of 1 per cent of a product will protect that product in the United States, amounting in this case to 64,000,000 head of cattle.

This question was investigated back in 1909, and, if I recall properly, Senator Lodge was on the investigating committee, and the committee was unanimous that any product produced in America, whether it was a farm product or a manufactured product, if there was a surplus to export to foreign countries, a protective tariff policy would not benefit that product.

Mr. BOX. My recollection is that Senator McCumber was a member of that commission. Will the gentleman insert that report in his remarks?

Mr. OLDFIELD. If I can find it, I will be glad to do so.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLDFIELD. I will.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman from Kansas intimidated me by his manner, and I was afraid to read this to him, but as confirming the fact that the farmers are demanding relief I want to read a resolution that the Farmers' Union in Nebraska, a real organization of farmers, passed at their last session. It is as follows:

We, the Farmers Union of Nebraska, favor the equality of agriculture in tariff legislation, and we believe that in the very nature of agricultural production the only way this can be achieved is through the reduction of the excessive protection that is now given manufacturers and nonagricultural industries.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Certainly, and that is the position that the farmers of America are taking everywhere at this time. There can be no question about it. The West is wrought up about this question. Senator Capper says that there is a cyclone or a tornado coming because the farmers of America are beginning to realize that under the Fordney-McCumber law the people are mulcted by more than \$5,000,000,000 every year in excess prices above reasonable prices to the American consumer.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER] says that the tariff on cattle allowed 154,000 head of cattle to come in when we have 64,000,000 head in the United States.

Take fencing wire. Do you suppose the farmers of Kansas use fencing wire—\$10 a ton in the Fordney-McCumber law on fence wire. The farmers lose more on fence wire than they get out of the entire tariff system.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Barbed wire is on the free list.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I am talking about fencing wire—all fencing wire is not barbed wire. The material that goes into the barbed wire is not on the free list, and the gentleman knows it. Iron and steel, out of which you make barbed wire, is on the protected list. The material that goes into the making of barbed wire is not on the free list.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. How much is the tariff?

Mr. OLDFIELD. I will put into the RECORD just how much the tariff is and let you place some figures of how much it increases the price of it.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Barbed wire?

Mr. OLDFIELD. All of the material that goes into barbed wire. Now, here is baling wire—do the farmers of Kansas use baling wire?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. That is on the free list.

Mr. OLDFIELD. No; one-half a cent a pound, or \$10 a ton. That is on the dutiable list. It was on the free list under the Underwood law, but you put it on the dutiable list at a half a cent a pound, or \$10 a ton. The farmer will lose more on fencing wire and baling wire than they get from giving protection to cattle.



Now, when Congress placed on the statute books the emergency tariff law, what happened? Wheat went down and down, and every real farmer knows that it went down. Now, when President Coolidge flexed it up—and it always is flexed upward—when he increased the tariff from 30 cents to 42 cents in 10 days it went down 12 cents on the bushel. That is what happened to the farmers here in America. This year we had a shortage of wheat of 200,000,000 bushels and wheat was selling at harvest time for about \$1 a bushel.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER] referred to his great bill regulating the grain exchange. My information is that the grain exchanges themselves had a great deal to do with writing the provisions of the grain exchange bill. We had a deficit in wheat of 200,000,000 bushels last year, but the farmers did not get the benefit of it. Wheat did not go up until the farmers had sold their wheat. When it got out of their hands it was \$2 a bushel, but it went back to \$1.70, not on the farm but in the Chicago market.

#### THE WHEAT FARMER AND THE TARIFF

##### *Estimates of the United States Department of Agriculture*

June 1, 1920. Average price received by producer on every type and grade, per bushel.....	\$2.583
June 1, 1920. Good milling wheat was worth near, on farm.....	3.00
June 1, 1920. Good milling wheat was worth near, at mill.....	3.30
Apr. 1, 1921. While emergency tariff bill was under discussion, average farm price.....	1.335
May 1, 1921. While emergency tariff bill was under discussion, average farm price.....	1.107
June 1, 1921. (After President Harding had signed the bill which was effective until the Fordney-McCumber bill was approved in 1922).....	1.274
July 1, 1921. (After President Harding had signed the bill which was effective until the Fordney-McCumber bill was approved in 1922).....	1.122
Aug. 1, 1921. (After President Harding had signed the bill which was effective until the Fordney-McCumber bill was approved in 1922).....	1.048
Sept. 1, 1921. (After President Harding had signed the bill which was effective until the Fordney-McCumber bill was approved in 1922).....	1.012
Nov. 1, 1921. (After President Harding had signed the bill which was effective until the Fordney-McCumber bill was approved in 1922).....	.942
Dec. 1, 1921. (After President Harding had signed the bill which was effective until the Fordney-McCumber bill was approved in 1922).....	.927

Throughout the year of 1922, during all of which time either the emergency tariff law or the new permanent tariff law was in effect, which was approved on September 21, 1922, and on December 17, 1922, Congress appropriated \$20,000,000 to buy wheat for Russian relief, the farm price ranged between 88.7 cents per bushel and \$1.21, closing at the end of the year at about 96 cents.

Under the Underwood law wheat was imported free. Under the emergency tariff (Republican) the duty was 35 cents per bushel, and under the Fordney-McCumber permanent tariff law (Republican) a duty of 30 cents per bushel was provided.

The average yield of wheat for the last five years in the United States has been about 880,000,000 bushels per annum.

The amount used for domestic consumption has been rather less than 575,000,000 bushels and about 75,000,000 bushels more are annually used for seed. This leaves a surplus of something like 230,000,000 bushels which can not possibly be consumed within the United States and must be sold abroad.

In 1910 the Republicans, through a special Senate committee, were forced to admit the fraud and deception they had practiced on the farmers by a tariff on agricultural products in their report and through their campaign textbook, as follows: "The tariff on the farmers' products, such as wheat, corn, rye, barley, cattle, and other livestock, did not and could not in any way affect the prices of these products." On this committee was Chairman Gallinger, Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts; Crawford, of South Dakota; Smoot, of Utah; and McCumber, of North Dakota. Their report on the effect of the tariff on agricultural products was unanimous.

Every person who is familiar with the Chicago Wheat Exchange, or the New York Cotton Exchange, or any of those exchanges, knows that you can not get as much at the farm as the quotations are every day on the Chicago Exchange, the New Orleans and the New York Cotton Exchanges. That is the situation. Any farm product or manufactured product can not be benefited by a protective tariff if you produce for export. The tariff on automobiles does not benefit the automobile industry at all; it does not put a dollar in their pockets. There is no nation on earth that can compete with the automobile manufacturers in America. Yet the automobile manufacturers in the country pay the highest wages of any industry and they are not benefited by the tariff, and they know it, and everybody else knows it. They export their surplus just as the wheat farmers do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHLBACH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7554) making appropriations for the Naval Department and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 20, 1926, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

292-293. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of Senate Resolution No. 438, dated February 26, 1923, a report for the month of December, 1925, showing the condition of railroad equipment and the related information indicated in the resolution, so far as such information is available; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

294. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, for cooperative construction of rural post roads, \$22,900,000, and construction of forest roads and trails, \$3,775,000 (H. Doc. No. 221); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

295. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress a draft of proposed legislation affecting the appropriation for the Department of the Interior for fees of examining surgeons, pensions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926 (H. Doc. No. 222); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

296. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the John Ericsson Memorial Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, to meet the expenses of the dedication of the John Ericsson memorial in May, 1926, \$3,500 (H. Doc. No. 223); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. FREDERICKS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1779. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Oregon and Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches across the Snake River at a point known as Ballards Landing; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4034. A bill granting consent of Congress to Texas-Coahuila Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande between Eagle Pass, Tex., and Piedras Negras, Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6515. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Gateway Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande between Brownsville, Tex., and Matamoros, Mexico; with amendments (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6733. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande; with an amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6740. A bill to authorize the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at or near a point about 2½ miles east of Williamson, Mingo County, W. Va., and near the mouth of Lick Branch; with amendments (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7669. A bill to provide home care for dependent children;



without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 187. A bill making a grant of land for school purposes, Fort Shaw division, Sun River project, Montana; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. GIFFORD: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5673. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue letters patent to George Hughes; with amendments (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7959) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McGinnis; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7538) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Bartlett; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7763) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Elder; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7697) granting an increase of pension to Jennie B. Darby; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 7960) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER of California: A bill (H. R. 7961) for the relief of former officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force and United States Marine Corps Reserve who were erroneously released from active duty and disenrolled at places other than their homes or places of enrollment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLAHERTY: A bill (H. R. 7962) to amend an act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: A bill (H. R. 7963) for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Miami, in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 7964) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Ambler, Montgomery County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 7965) granting leave of absence to officers and employees of the Government who attend the citizens military training camps; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WELLER: A bill (H. R. 7966) to provide the name by which the Board of General Appraisers and members thereof shall hereafter be known; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 7967) authorizing the retirement of acting assistant surgeons of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 7968) regulating immigration and naturalization of certain veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7969) to amend the act entitled "An act to license customhouse brokers," approved June 10, 1910, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 7970) to authorize the cancellation under certain conditions of patents in fee simple to Indians for allotments held in trust by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 7971) to provide cooperation to safeguard endangered agricultural and municipal interests and to protect the forest cover on the Santa Barbara, Angeles, San Bernardino, and Cleveland National Forests from destruction by fire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 7972) to prohibit offering for sale as Federal farm-loan bonds any securities not issued under the terms of the farm-loan act, to limit the use of the words "Federal," "United States," or "reserve," or a combination of such words, to prohibit false advertising, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 7973) to provide American registry for the Norwegian sailing vessel *Derwent*; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 7974) to amend further an act entitled "An act to regulate foreign commerce by prohibiting the admission into the United States of certain adulterated grain and seeds unfit for seeding purposes," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 7975) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia in relation to descent and distribution; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEAL: A bill (H. R. 7976) providing for the restoration of the old lighthouse at Cape Henry, Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 7977) to make additions, extensions, and improvements to the post-office building at Aiken, S. C., to be used as post office and courthouse; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 7978) to prevent gambling in cotton futures and make it unlawful for any person, corporation, or association of persons to sell any contract for future delivery of any cotton within the United States, unless such seller is actually the legitimate owner of the cotton so contracted for future delivery at the time said sale or contract of sale is made; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 7979) granting to the Yosemite Valley Railroad Co. the right of way through certain public lands for the relocation of part of its existing railroad; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 7980) to change the name of the Department of the Interior to the Department of Public Works and Domain and to provide for the reorganization and more effective coordination of the public-works functions of the Federal Government to the aforesaid department; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BOWLING: Resolution (H. Res. 94) to print 2,500 copies of the Soil Survey of Tallapoosa County, Ala.; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 95) to print 2,500 copies of the Soil Survey of Autauga County, Ala.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Resolution (H. Res. 96) to provide for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7893, entitled "A bill to create a division of cooperative marketing in the Department of Agriculture," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Resolution (H. Res. 97) for the appointment of a special committee, composed of seven Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker, to inquire into the construction of submarines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 7981) providing for the examination and survey of the channel from the North River, via Back Sound, to Lighthouse Bay, N. C., with a view of providing a depth of 5 feet; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 7982) granting a pension to Mary L. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7983) granting a pension to Nannie E. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 7984) for the relief of Herman M. Bernelot Moens; to the Committee on Claims.



By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 7985) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Jane Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7986) granting an increase of pension to Luman B. Palmeter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 7987) granting an increase of pension to John T. Rossee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 7988) granting an increase of pension to Christina Muller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 7989) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7990) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7991) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 7992) granting a pension to Sarah L. Greene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 7993) granting an increase of pension to Thirza E. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 7994) granting a pension to Elizabeth Haas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 7995) granting a pension to Howard E. Tolson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 7996) for the relief of Detroit Fidelity & Surety Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 7997) granting an increase of pension to Ann Boggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7998) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIEFNER: A bill (H. R. 7999) granting a pension to John J. Saffell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KUNZ: A bill (H. R. 8000) for the relief of Harry A. Tedswell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8001) granting a pension to Sarah E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8002) granting an increase of pension to Adelle Tobey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 8003) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Zimmerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8004) granting an increase of pension to Susan Witman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8005) granting an increase of pension to Leah Brunner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 8006) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8007) granting a pension to Nancy Reedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 8008) granting an increase of pension to Herbert O. Kohr; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8009) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8010) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 8011) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Findley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: A bill (H. R. 8012) granting a pension to James Cash; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 8013) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Mallery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8014) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8015) granting an increase of pension to Jane Pelletier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 8016) granting an increase of pension to Arsula Bagley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 8017) for the relief of James M. Thomas; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8018) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 8019) granting a pension to Mary Abbie Mears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8020) granting an increase of pension to George Ann Tadlock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8021) granting a pension to Adaline Macaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8022) granting an increase of pension to Herbert Edward Poynter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 8023) authorizing the President to appoint Albert L. Derbyshire surgeon in the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 8024) granting a pension to Eliza Blake; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 8025) granting an increase of pension to Lucina Hightower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8026) granting a pension to Addie Bayles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8027) for the relief of John P. Stafford; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8028) granting a pension to William E. Worden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 8029) granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Griswold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 8030) granting an increase of pension to Ida O. Southwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 8031) for the relief of Abraham L. Alexander, postmaster of Plymouth, N. C., for postal funds stolen from the post office in said town; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8032) granting a pension to Emily Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8033) to authorize the general accounting officers of the United States to allow credit to Galen L. Tait, collector and disbursing agent, district of Maryland, for payments of travel and subsistence expenses made on property certified and approved vouchers; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

399. Petition of the National Sculpture Society, 215 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City, concerning a number of war memorials being erected throughout the country; to the Committee on the Library.

400. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of Republican organization of the twenty-second assembly district, New York City, regarding the present coal situation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

401. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the Carded Woolen Manufacturers' Association, Boston, Mass., recommending certain changes in the Merritt "misbranding" bill (H. R. 3904); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

402. By Mr. GARBER: Letter from the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Oklahoma City, Okla., relative to House bill 4798; to the Committee on Agriculture.

403. Also, petition of the employees of the United States Railroad Labor Board, asking the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate and the House to consider an amendment to proposed bills S. 2306 and H. R. 7180; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

404. Also, recommendations of the Oklahoma Society of Certified Public Accountants, in regard to the proposed 1926 Federal revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

405. Also, article by F. I. Brown, president Babson's Service Co., relative to existing postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

406. By Mr. KIEFNER: Resolution from the Flat River Chamber of Commerce, of Flat River, Mo., favoring the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building for the use of the United States post office at that place; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

407. By Mr. LEAVITT: Petition of the Montana Federation of Women's Clubs, and Woman's Clubs at Missoula, Phillipsburg, Dutton, Deer Lodge, Ollie, Harlem, Helena, and Ringling, Mont., urging reenactment of the Sheppard-Towner maternity act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

408. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, in favor of the Gooding long-and-short-haul bill; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.